OLIVER B. LANGWORTHY

Gregory of Nazianzus' Soteriological Pneumatology

Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum

Mohr Siebeck

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity

Herausgeber/Editors
Christoph Markschies (Berlin) · Martin Wallraff (München)
Christian Wildberg (Pittsburgh)

Beirat/Advisory Board
Peter Brown (Princeton) · Susanna Elm (Berkeley)
Johannes Hahn (Münster) · Emanuela Prinzivalli (Rom)
Jörg Rüpke (Erfurt)

117

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Oliver B. Langworthy

Gregory of Nazianzus' Soteriological Pneumatology

Mohr Siebeck

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Oliver B. Langworthy, born 1988; 2010 MTheol (Hons); 2012 MLitt; 2016 PhD in Historical Theology from the University of St Andrews; since 2017 Associate Lecturer in the School of Divinity at the University of St Andrews.
orcid.org/0000-0002-9382-0600

ISBN 978-3-16-158951-5 / eISBN 978-3-16-158952-2
DOI 10.1628 / 978-3-16-158952-2

ISSN 1436-3003 / eISSN 2568-7433 (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

© 2019 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Preface

This book argues that soteriological operation of the Holy Spirit, or soteriological pneumatology, of Gregory of Nazianzus is a coherent, essential, but underexamined area of his thought. Gregory's soteriological pneumatology is surprisingly absent from scholarship, particularly in light of a resurgent interest in pneumatology, and in Gregory's use of θέωσις. A few authors in the vanguard, particularly Christopher Beeley, pointed towards the problem: Gregory's theology depends on his commitment to the divinity and action of the Spirit. The desire to better understand this commitment formed the impetus for the present study, which was submitted as a doctoral dissertation at the University of St Andrews in 2016. Questions of the context, technical language, and development of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology presented a fascinating thread that ran throughout his career, touching on innumerable other areas and colouring his engagement with both friends and enemies. The depth of his investment in the experience of the process of salvation, realised by and in the individual with the Spirit, was at its clearest when Gregory rejected illustrations and an economy of language to declare "God the Spirit," but also shone through in Gregory's self-expression of how he came to be who and what he was. By recovering Gregory's emphasis on a "truly holy" Spirit, operative in the perfection of the believer, and examining it in detail, I hope that this book will contribute, in some way, to the ongoing discussion on the depth of meaning to be found in θέωσις, and even more so to the place of the Holy Spirit as a subject of primary theological reflection.

I would not have been able to complete this work without the toleration and guidance of, particularly, Prof Mark Elliott, Prof Ivor Davidson, and Dr Rebecca Langworthy. Each in their own way contributed invaluable insight and support and without whom I would never have had the chance to pursue these questions. I am exceedingly grateful to Dr Rebekah Dyer and Dr Terry Wright for their assistance with proofreading and indexing. Finally, I would like to extend my thanks to those at Mohr Siebeck who helped guide this volume from a doctoral dissertation to a monograph. I owe great thanks to all these people, and to many more, but I alone lay claim to any mistakes.

Oliver B. Langworthy, Kirkton of Largo, 2019

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

Preface V

Abbreviations XI

Chronology XI

Introduction 1

Chapter 1: Salvation and the Spirit in the Fourth Century 14

A. Mind and the Trinity 14

I. Monarchy and Creation 15
II. Movement and Identity 19
III. Knowledge and the Spirit 23

B. Trajectories in the Fourth Century 27

I. Soteriological Pneumatologies 27
1. Marcellus of Ancyra 29
2. Cyril of Jerusalem 33
3. Athanasius of Alexandria 37
4. Didymus and a Contemporary Spirit 41
II. Conclusion 44

Chapter 2: Salvation and the Spirit Between Athens and Nazianzus 46

A. Early Metaphors for Salvation 46

I. Assessing Metaphor in Gregory 46
II. Language and the Individual 50
III. Language and the Community 54

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

B. Questioning Technical Language 59

I. Bounding Θέωσις 59
II. Conclusion 67

Chapter 3: Salvation and the Spirit in Gregory and Basil's Divisions 69

A. Issues at Stake between Basil and Gregory 69

I. Audience and Tension 69
1. Relevance of the Spirit 72
2. Gregory's Commitment to Basil 74

B. Before "God the Spirit" 75

I. Fear of the Spirit 75
II. Bonds of the Spirit 78
III. Teachings of the Spirit 81

C. A Divine Spirit 87

I. Declaring the Spirit God 87
II. Basil on the Spirit 88
III. Dispute with Basil 91

D. Mediation Between Christ and the Spirit 95

I. The Spirit in Gregory the Elder and Julian the Tax-Collector 95
II. Conclusion 96

Chapter 4: Salvation and the Spirit in the Perfect Temple 99

A. The Church in Gregory's Early Constantinople Orations 99

I. Approaching Constantinople 99
1. Seeking Salvation in Luke 19:9 102
2. Living Temples 103
II. Peace in the Temple 106

B. Deification, Harmony, and the Spirit 109

I. Hierarchy and the Believer 109
II. Equality in Authority 114

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

C. Salvation in Christ and the Spirit 118

I. The Agency of the Spirit 118
II. The Life of Christ as Context 123
III. Interrogating the Golden Chain 130
IV. Conclusion 132

Chapter 5: Salvation and the Spirit in Essence 134

A. Holiness and the Spirit 134

I. The Holy Spirit is Truly Holy 134
II. Knowledge as Sealed and Secure 141

B. Reflecting on Himself and on Basil's The Holy Spirit 146

I. The Spirit as Agent in the Self-Representational Poems 146
II. The Spirit as Inaugurator 147
III. The Spirit as Jailor 150
IV. The Spirit as Guide 152

C. The Spirit as Glorifier, Illuminator, Purifier, Deifier, but not Saviour .. 156

I. The Spirit as the Agent of Human Good 156
II. Vindicating Basil's Soteriological Pneumatology 159

Conclusion 162

Bibliography 167

Index of References 177

Subject Index 184

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Abbreviations

Primary Sources

Athanasius of Alexandria

Ep. Serap.	*Epistulae ad Serapionem* (Letters to Serapion)
Gent.	*Contra gentes* (Against the Gentiles)
Inc.	*De incarnatione verbi* (On the Incarnation)
Or. c. Ar.	*Orationes contra Arianos* (Against the Arians)

Cyril of Jerusalem

Cat.	*Catecheses ad illuminandos* (Catechetical Lectures)
M. Cat.	*Mystagogiae* (Mystagogic Catechesis)

Didymus of Alexandria

Spir.	*De Spiritu Sancto* (On the Holy Spirit)
Trin.	*De Trinitate* (On the Trinity)

Gregory of Nazianzus

Carm.	*Carmen* (Poem)
DVS	*De vita sua* (On his own life)
DRS	*De rebus suis* (On his own affairs)
Ep.	*Epistula* (Letter)
Or.	*Oratio* (Oration)

Gregory Thaumaturgus

Pan.	*In Origenem oratio panegyrica* (Panegyric for Origen)

Gregory the Presbyter

Vita	*Vita Sancti Gregorii* (The Life of Saint Gregory)

Marcellus of Ancyra

Ast.	*Contra Asterius* (Against Asterius)
Fr.	*Fragmenta* (Fragment)
Inc. Ar.	*De incarnatione et contra Arianos* (On the Incarnation Against the Arians)

Basil of Caesarea

Hom.	*Homilia* (Homily)
DSS	*De Spiritu Sancto* (On the Holy Spirit)

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Secondary Sources

ACO	*Acta concilliorum oecumenicorum*
ANF	*The Ante-Nicene Fathers*
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum: Series graeca
FC	Fathers of the Church
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement
NPNF	*The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*
PG	*Patrologia graeca*
PGL	Patristic Greek Lexicon
SC	Sources chrétiennes
StPatr	Studia patristica
VC	*Vigiliae christianae*

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Chronology

	325	Council of Nicaea
Chapter 1	329–330	Gregory of Nazianzus is born.
	336	Marcellus of Ancyra, *Ast*.
	351	Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cats*. 16–17
	359–360	Athanasius of Alexandria, *Ep*. *Serap*.
Chapter 2	361	*Ep*. 6
	362	Gregory ordained.
		Ors. 1–3
	362–363	*Ors*. 4–5, 6
	368	*Or*. 14
Chapter 3	371	*Ors*. 7–8
	372	Gregory made bishop of Sasima.
	372–373	*Ors*. 9–12
	373	*Ep*. 45; *Or*. 13; Basil of Caesarea, *Hom*. 15; *Ep*. 58
	374	*Ors*. 18–19
Chapter 4	379	Gregory made bishop of Constantinople.
	380	*Ors*. 21–22, 24, 30, 32, 34, 29–31, 41
Chapter 5	380–381	*Ors*. 25–26, 37, 38–40.
	381	Council of Constantinople
		Carms. 2.1.1, 2.1.11.
		Or. 42
		Or. 43
	390	Gregory of Nazianzus dies.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Gregory of Nazianzus' contributions to the doctrine of the Spirit are among the most significant of any Christian theologian. Along with his fellow Cappadocians, Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa, he is regarded as having been formative in the Trinitarian debates of the fourth century C.E.[1] In later reception, he is seen as a pivotal figure in the debate over the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Alone among the florilegia on the nature of Christ in the *Address to Marcion,* appended to the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, he is given the honorific "the Theologian."[2] With his works having circulated widely among the Byzantines, his coining of θέωσις and widespread adaptation of earlier deification terminology established the language around which Eastern soteriology would come to be organised.[3] These Trinitarian, pneumatological, and soteriological developments have been understood as closely related on the basis of Gregory's own question: "If [the Spirit] is ranked with me, how can he make me God, or unite me to the Godhead?"[4] Despite this close association between the Spirit and salvation, their interrelationship has received little sustained attention. Many studies relegate Gregory's contributions to footnotes or cast him only as a contributor to a broadly-defined Cappadocian theology, often exemplified by Basil of Caesarea. Those that recognise Gregory's contributions have largely studied the relationship between Spirit and salvation – his soteriological pneumatology – only as part of Gregory's larger

[1] All dates, unless otherwise noted, are C.E.

[2] Richard Price et al., trans, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. 3 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005), 117. See also Oliver Langworthy, "Theodoret's Theologian: Assessing the Origin and Significance of Gregory of Nazianzus' Title," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 70, no. 3 (2019), 455–71.

[3] On Gregory's reception into Byzantine hymnography see Bogdan G. Bucur et al, "Gregory Nazianzen's Reading of Habbakuk 3:2 and Its Reception: A Lesson From Byzantine Scripture Exegesis," *Pro Ecclesia* 20, no. 1 (2011): 87.

[4] *Or*. 31.4. SC 250, 282. Εἰ τέτακται μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ, πῶς ἐμὲ ποιεῖ Θεόν, ἢ πῶς συνάπτει θεότητι; Quotations will include English and Greek with a reference to the relevant version of the Greek text. Where third party translations have been used, such as in clarifying disputed language or where good translations already exist, the translators are noted. Subsequent references to primary sources will not include the Greek unless necessary for comprehension.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

"Trinitarian project."[5] This soteriological pneumatology has particularly been read in light of his Christology, leading to the summation of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology as "[w]hat Christ accomplishes universally, the Spirit perfects particularly."[6] This project does not seek to overturn this consensus view of the Spirit's activity in salvation, following as it does from Gregory's own assertion that the "order of theology [τάξιν θεολογίας]" is best adhered to: the progressive revelation of God clearly and the Son obscurely in the Hebrew Bible, Christ and the intimation of the Spirit in the New Testament, and "now" the indwelling of the Spirit.[7] However, this project does seek to address a gap in the literature that has resulted from Gregory's soteriological pneumatology having been studied only as part of his Trinitarian project or without reference to context and chronology. While it is not appropriate to completely separate the persons of the Trinity in Gregory's thought, it is necessary to recognise that the Gregory of 381 who argued for adherence to the "order of theology" was himself a product of reflection and debate in an ongoing "now" of the revealed Spirit. While it was never his sole focus, the place of the Spirit in salvation is found throughout Gregory's corpus, acting as a touchstone for reflections on broader themes throughout the course of his life, alongside and integral to his defence of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ.[8] A consideration of the historical context of Gregory's early life, his family, and its historical context is therefore instructive.

[5] The phrase "soteriological pneumatology" is being used here to encompass a number of ideas expressed by deification language such as θέωσις, or, as in Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen's *One With God: Salvation as Deification and Justification* (Collegeville: Unitas, 2003), 32 "pneumatological soteriology." The intent is to highlight Gregory's attribution of saving activity to the Spirit in essence, rather than as a requirement of an abstract theology. It originates in Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts*, *JSNTSup* 54 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 283, where it is used to express the "soteriological dimension of the Spirit's activity."

[6] This version of the formulation derives from Donald Winslow, *The Dynamics of Salvation: A Study in Gregory of Nazianzus* (Cambridge: The Philadelphia Patristics Foundation, 1979), 129. Others are to be found in Vladimir Lossky, "Redemption and Deification," in *In the Image and Likeness of God* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974), 55; and Christopher Beeley, *Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God: In Your Light We Shall See Light* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 178. See also Gregory Hillis, "Pneumatology and Soteriology according to Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria," StPatr 67 (2013), 189–90 for a further recapitulation of this idea, based on Winslow and Beeley.

[7] *Or*. 31.27. SC 250, 328.

[8] The following makes mention of those works which will be the subject of this project. For a more comprehensive, but relatively compact, account of the place of all Gregory's works in his life and their context see Beeley, *Knowledge*, 3–62.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Gregory of Nazianzus was born to an aristocratic family of landowners at Arianzus in Cappadocia around 330.[9] The moment into which Gregory was born was marked by the end of the Diocletian persecution in 311, the legalisation of Christianity in 313, and the Council of Nicaea in 325. It was a time of ascendancy for Christianity, broadly understood.[10] This had direct consequences on his family when his father, Gregory the Elder, was converted to Christianity by his wife Nonna.[11] Gregory the Elder and Nonna were wealthy, with the former having been a member of the local Hypsistarian Jewish-pagan sect and most probably a member of the aristocracy.[12] Gregory the Elder exerted both temporal and spiritual authority on a diverse community, and the effects of this were apparent in a son who enjoyed the privileges of an expansive education. The young Gregory was tutored in grammar at Nazianzus, before continuing his studies in Caesarea Mazica in Cappadocia, and expanding into philosophy and rhetoric in Caesarea Maritima in Palestine.[13] After two years there, he spent a further ten in Athens pursuing an education in rhetoric alongside Basil.[14] Gregory departed shortly after his contemporary, and was called by his father to be ordained and to assist him in the management of the see in the face of schism.[15]

If the historical moment of Gregory's birth was defined by the growth of Christianity with its legalisation under Constantine I and the convocation of the Council of Nicaea, his youth and the beginning of his manhood were similarly defined by the ascent of Constantius II as first Caesar, then Augustus in the East, and finally sole emperor until his death in 361. Constantius

[9] There is an excellent biography of Gregory of Nazianzus, which deals thoroughly with Gregory's life, in the form of McGuckin's intellectual biography. It deals more completely with Gregory's life than the short biographies that preface most works on Gregory, including this one. See John McGuckin, *Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography* (New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 1–83 for Gregory's early life. See also Gregory the Presbyter, *Vita Sancti Gregorii Theologi*, 2, in CCSG 44 *Corpus Nazianzenum* 11 (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2001), 123.

[10] Martin Wallraff, *Sonnenkönig der Spätantike: die Religionspolitik Konstantins des Großen* (Freiburg: Herder, 2013), 135.

[11] *Carm*. 2.1.11.55–58. Carolinne White, trans. and ed., *Gregory of Nazianzus: Autobiographical Poems*, Cambridge Medieval Classics 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 14. Closer analysis of *De Vita Sua*, the principle source of biographical detail on Gregory's life, will be reserved to later chapters alongside contemporary works.

[12] Debate over the social status of all the Cappadocian Fathers has been ongoing. See in particular Thomas Kopecek, "The Social Class of the Cappadocian Fathers," *Church History* 42:4 (1973), 453–66; Ernst Kirsten, "Cappadocia," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 2:861–91; Stanislas Giet, "Basile, était-il Sénateur," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 60 (1965): 429–44.

[13] *Vita*, 3.

[14] *Carm*. 2.1.11.211–22.

[15] *Carm*. 2.1.11.345.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

II's support of Arian Christianity had a further role in shaping Gregory's early adulthood.[16] The cause for the schism within his father's church, and thus the need for Gregory's summoning and ordination, was Gregory the Elder's apparent acceptance of an Arian doctrine of the Trinity.[17] Gregory initially fled his father's call, and spent time with Basil in the latter's monastic community before returning to Nazianzus, where he reluctantly took up his place as an ordained priest in his father's episcopacy.[18] Although Gregory's interest in the action of the Spirit is often located later, in his episcopal orations, it is in reflecting on this period of his life (in 361 and after his ordination) that he first began to write about the guidance of the Spirit and the deification of Basil's monks.[19] The Spirit as guide to Christ and agent of renewal is apparent throughout his earliest orations on Easter and in defence of his flight from ordination in 362.[20] The same implicit interest in salvation and deification is found in those works that are the highlight of this period of his life, *Ors*. 4 and 5, delivered in 362 to 363. The impact of the wider historical context on Gregory's life did not end with the the reign of Constantius II, and nor did the schism in Gregory's church that the former emperor's support for Arianism occasioned. Even as Gregory was still attempting to quell discontent in his father's see, he was directly contending with Constantius II's pagan convert successor, Julian, in *Ors*. 4 and 5. *Or*. 4 has received extensive attention for Gregory's coining of θέωσις, but is itself a product of his reflection on how the place of the Spirit in the believer's salvation is worked out in the Christian life.[21] This ongoing reflection can be seen in the final years of Gregory's first tenure at Nazianzus, in his *Ors*. 14, 7, and 8 in the period between 363 and 370. During this time, he was responsible for a see troubled by famine and disaster, and was himself beset by the deaths of his brother and sister.[22] The death of Julian in 363 did not occasion an end to the political, social, and religious turmoil that impacted Gregory's life so strongly. The ascent of Valens brought an end to Julian's pagan revivalism but also continued imperial support for Arianism.

The intellectual groundwork of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology was laid out in this early period; but it began to flourish after his ordination to

[16] See especially Hanns Christof Brennecke, *Ecclesia est in re publica* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 52–54 on the theological situation around Constantius II.

[17] McGuckin, *Intellectual Biography*, 107–9.

[18] *Carm*. 2.1.11.351–53.

[19] *Ep*. 6.3–4.

[20] *Or*. 1.2; *Or*. 2.7.

[21] For developed treatments of the context of this oration, see Jean Bernardi, *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 4–5* (SC 309); Alois Kurmann, *Gregor von Nazianz, Oratio IV gegen Julian, ein Kommentar* (Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1988); Leonardo Lugaresi, *Gregorio di Nazianzo, Contro Giuliano l'Apostata, Orazione IV* (Firenze: Nardini Editore, 1993).

[22] *Carm*. 2.1.11.371.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

the episcopacy in 372. Gregory initially fled from this as well, seeing little value in the see of Sasima to which he was to be appointed, and apparently resenting what he would later characterise as further coercion by Basil in an effort to support the latter's episcopacy of Caesarea.[23] After briefly withdrawing, Gregory's father's entreaties to return drew the younger Gregory back, though ultimately to Nazianzus as an assistant and not to Sasima.[24] The first orations he delivered as a bishop, *Ors*. 9–12, are laden with pneumatological and soteriological material. Between 372 to 373 Gregory asserted that to reveal the Spirit was his work in an oration delivered with Basil in the audience.[25] This identification of himself with the Spirit, and the work of the Spirit in the believer, presaged a rupture in the relationship between Basil and Gregory over the former's unwillingness to make an open declaration of the divinity of the Spirit.[26] Between 373 and 374, Gregory delivered an encomium for his father, and following a short tenure as sole bishop of Nazianzus after effectively rejecting his see of Sasima, again fled, entering seclusion at the monastery of St Thecla in Seleucia.[27] This withdrawal from public life lasted until 379. In the interim, Basil had published his *DSS*, and taken up the public defence of the divinity of the Spirit that Gregory had abandoned during his retreat from Nazianzus.

While Gregory had withdrawn from Basil's attempts to elevate him to the see of Sasima to support Basil's own efforts against Arian bishops, the ascent of Theodosius I to the imperial throne and his efforts to oppose Arianism seems to have wrought a change in Gregory. Gregory returned to public life as the bishop of Constantinople, elevated to the post as part of an effort to counter-act so-called Arian influence in the Eastern capital. This was not an end to the development of his soteriological pneumatology.[28] On the contrary, nine orations, delivered between 379 and 380, are the most consistently constructive sermons he delivered on the nature of the Spirit and its relationship to the church. Gregory himself conceived of his installation as by the grace of the Spirit.[29] Throughout these, there is a focus on how the Spirit acts as the

[23] *Carm*. 2.1.11.446–51.

[24] *Carm*. 2.1.11.490–98.

[25] *Or*. 10.2.

[26] Ep. 58.

[27] *Carm*. 2.1.11.547–49. White notes that Gregory's specific reference to his failure to perform his episcopal duties in Sasima serves to reinforce an argument that he was never really a bishop before his election to Constantinople. See Carolinne White, *Gregory of Nazianzus: Autobiographical Poems* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 51, n. 51.

[28] McGuckin's extensive consideration of the events leading up to Gregory's appointment, and the parties involved, is instructive. See McGuckin, *Gregory*, 234–40.

[29] *Carm*. 2.1.11.591–92.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

foundation not just of the believer, but through the harmonisation of believers as the foundation of the body of Christ in the world.[30]

The next five works Gregory delivered, the *Theological Orations* of 381, represent not so much greater development of his soteriological pneumatology as a full exposition of that which had come before. *Or*. 31, and its "order of theology" are part of this great exposition, but the situation into which it was spoken needs to be kept in sight to understand it. At this point, Gregory was at the height of his authority – delivering orations to the Emperor Theodosius, nominally supported by Alexandrian bishops, and successful at combating the heresies which had brought about his appointment to Constantinople. They were intended to persuade and to defend Gregory's then strong position. The same cannot be said of those works which follow the *Theological Orations*, delivered just before and during the sitting of the Council of Constantinople and immediately afterwards.[31] Even before the Council, Gregory found his position nearly usurped, and then floundered in his attempt to have the Council affirmatively adopt language on the divinity of the Spirit.[32] Despite these losses, culminating in his withdrawal from the Council's presidency and the see of Constantinople in exchange for Nazianzus, as well as the delivery of a climactic oration delivered before Theodosius, his soteriological pneumatology remained the subject of ongoing reflection.[33]

This applies not just to his prose, but to Gregory's poetry as well. Two major poetic works produced during this period, *DRS* and *DVS*, were intended to establish the narrative of his time in Constantinople, and although they display few flashes of new insight into his pneumatology, still return to the Spirit's intervention in order to explain Gregory's actions. His withdrawal from Constantinople and return to Nazianzus between late 381 and 382 marked an end to the restraint of his later Constantinopolitan works on the Spirit's action in salvation. His valedictory oration, supposedly a recounting of what he said to the council as he stepped down, and the *Poemata Arcana*, are the full flowering of reflection on soteriological pneumatology decades in

[30] *Ors*. 20, 22, 24, 32, 33, 23, 21, 34, 41. The order is debatable. This represents the ordering offered by Beeley for Gregory's Constantinopolitan orations and those that follow. See Beeley, *Trinity*, 34–60.

[31] *Ors*. 25, 26, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40.

[32] *Carm*. 2.1.11.1703.

[33] The exact reason for Gregory's withdrawal from the Council of Constantinople is not certain. Meredith, at least, identifies it as having been Gregory's insistence on the divinity of the Spirit. Gregory himself is evasive and attributes his removal to the moral shortcomings of those who engineered his downfall rather than any specific aspect question of doctrine. See Anthony Meredith, "The Pneumatology of the Cappadocian Fathers and the Creed of Constantinople," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 48 (1981), 210. The absence of any defence of the Spirit or of deification, as for example in *Or*. 11, in *DVS*, is addressed in Chapter 5 here.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

the making. Gregory continued as bishop of Nazianzus, writing until his death around 389. His funeral oration for Basil, later poetry, orations, and letters all point towards an intellectual whose public defeat did not dampen his enthusiasm for either his "work" in service of the Spirit or the rich theology which emerged from it.[34] Alongside these personal investments, it is important to remember how much of Gregory's life was directly influenced by, and directly interacting with, the wider historical context of the time. He was born into the liberation of Christianity from the threat of persecution, came to adulthood during the ascendancy of Arianism supported by Constantine's heirs, and spent the first years of his priesthood combating both the consequences of that support and Julian's efforts to revive paganism. That Gregory saw himself as husbanding a vital but beleaguered cause in support of the Spirit is no surprise – the action of the Spirit was, for him, essential to resolving the political and spiritual crises with which he was confronted. This view of Gregory's life highlights the Spirit as the foundation of his wider theology, rather than as its outworking.[35]

On the contrary, scholarship on Gregory has usually regarded his pneumatology as the conclusion of a broader "Trinitarian project," when it has anything to say about it at all, despite the substantial amount of literature available. Gregory's work has been a subject of study and inquiry since at least as early as Maximus the Confessor's *Ambigua* but has only in the last few decades seen renewed attention in Western scholarship.[36] This is not to say that there has not been scholarship on Gregory's pneumatology or soteriology. Two monographs dedicated solely to his soteriology were produced in the twentieth century. Donald Winslow's *Dynamics of Salvation* has been the most influential upon later Western scholarship, but this is to neglect Heinz Althaus' *Die Heilslehre des heiligen Gregor von Nazianz*. Althaus produced this extensive treatment of Gregory's soteriology before Winslow.[37] Winslow

[34] On *In suos versus*, but providing a very useful general overview of Gregory's poetry through it see Celica Milovanovic-Barham, "Gregory of Nazianzus: Ars Poetica (In suos versus: Carmen 2.1.39)," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5, no. 4 (1997): 497ff.

[35] Phillip Rousseau's reflection on the works in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* is offers a valuable summary, where he notes that whatever is made of Gregory he was "recognizably typical but unlivened by a new mobility" and that his "field of discovery was the homeland he never left." Phillip Rousseau, "Retrospect: Images, Reflections and the 'Essential' Gregory," in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (ed. Jostein Børtnes et al; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006), 295.

[36] Christopher Beeley, ed., *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus: Essays on History, Theology, and Culture* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012), ix. Susanna Elm, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus and the Vision of Rome* (London: University of California Press, 2012).

[37] Winslow (1979); Heinz Althaus, *Die Heilslehre des heiligen Gregor von Nazianz* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1974). Few reviewers at the time seem to have been aware of this,

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

was himself quite aware of Althaus, writing in his preface that "This present study and that of Althaus cover much of the same ground (conceptually) but are quite different methodologically, and the conclusions as to what, for Gregory, consists of "salvation" also diverge."[38] Without being too simplistic, the divergence to which Winslow points is that Althaus is concerned about the "final destiny" of humanity, while Winslow wants to locate a more metaphorical θέωσις in the contours of the Christian life.[39] On Gregory's pneumatology, Daniel Opperwall's doctoral thesis "The Holy Spirit in Gregory of Nazianzus" identifies itself as the only monograph-length study on the Spirit in Gregory, but this overlooks Thomas A. Noble's own doctoral thesis, "The Deity of the Holy Spirit According to Gregory Nazianzus."[40] Noble and Opperwall cover similar territory, in much the same way as Althaus and Winslow do. However, Noble's aims are more limited than those of Opperwall, who has more to say concerning Gregory's soteriological pneumatology – the scope of Opperwall's project being such that reference to the subject is almost inevitable. In addition to these texts, there are a large number of articles, chapters, and monographs which treat with the same subjects in brief.[41] Winslow, Meredith, Norris, and to a lesser extent Hanson, all noted the importance of deification by the Spirit for Gregory's wider theological thought; but even these relegate Gregory's pneumatology to a subsidiary position either in his own thinking or with regard to his immediate contemporaries.[42]

---

despite Althaus' publication appearing only five years before, and Winslow's own acknowledgment of it.

[38] Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, v.

[39] Althaus, *Heilslehre des heiligen*, 208; Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, 191.

[40] See Daniel Opperwall, "The Holy Spirit in the Life and Writings of Gregory of Nazianzus" PhD Thesis (McMaster University, 2012) *Open Access Dissertations and Theses*, Paper 7349; Thomas A. Noble, "The Deity of the Holy Spirit According to Gregory of Nazianzus" PhD Thesis. (Edinburgh University, 1989). Noble's contribution is absent from Opperwall and Beeley's bibliographies, but notably present in McGuckin, *Gregory*.

[41] Henry Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church* (London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1912); G.L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London: William Heinemann,, 1936); Jean Plagnieux, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze théologien* (Paris: Éditions franciscaines, 1952); Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma* (ed. Neil Buchanan, 3rd ed.; Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1976); Meredith, *Pneumatology*, 196–211; Thomas F. Torrance, *The Trinitarian Faith* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988); R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988); Claudio Moreschini, int., *Grégoire de Nazianze Discours 38–41*, SC 358 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990); Frederick Norris, *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning: The Five Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991); McGuckin, *Gregory*; Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) have been the works most influential on the study of Gregory's pneumatology and soteriology outside of those we have already discussed.

[42] These interactions are all extensively noted by Beeley. See Beeley, *Trinity*, 176.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

The work most influential on recent studies of Gregory's pneumatology was that of Beeley, whose claim that Gregory's pneumatology has been under-examined has been repeated in the succession of works that have commented on Gregory's pneumatology after Beeley.[43] The paucity of work on Gregory's pneumatology, let alone its soteriological implications, is exemplified in the further reading suggested by Sykes in his commentary on Gregory's *Poemata Arcana*. Whereas he has exhaustive reading lists before the other poems, he directs readers to "books referred to for his Trinitarian thinking," and to 13 pages of Schermann's *Die Gottheit des heiligen Geistes nach den griechischen Vätern des vierten Jahrhunderts* and six pages of Galtier's *Le Saint-Esprit en nous d'après les Pères Grecs* – works written 96 and 51 years prior to Sykes' own, respectively.[44] Beeley's monograph, *Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God: In Your Light We Shall See Light*, as well as shorter works on the subject, "The Holy Spirit in Gregory Nazianzen: The pneumatology of Oration 31" and "The Holy Spirit in the Cappadocians: Past and Present," have encouraged new work on Gregory's pneumatology and soteriology.[45] Beeley not only identified the soteriological underpinnings of Gregory's pneumatology that these imply but argued for Gregory's Holy Spirit as the "ontic and epistemic basis of the entire doctrine of grace" and to clarify the difference between "not universal and particular salvation, but between the ideal or potential salvation embodied in Christ and the actual salvation that the Holy Spirit realises in the Christian life."[46] In short, Beeley places the Spirit at the foundation not only of Gregory's thinking on salvation generally but also of its expression in the world. While these

[43] Andrew Hofer, *Christ in the Life and Teaching of Gregory of Nazianzus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 191, n. 196: "Gregory's pneumatology has been underappreciated, a fact Christopher Beeley brings out well and party rectifies…" Or in Opperwall, "Holy Spirit," 3, n. 11: "Beeley is quick to note the pressing need for further scholarship on Gregory's pneumatology." In Beeley's own words, "A surge of new interest in the Holy Spirit has touched on many areas of Christian theology… This renewal follows a long period of neglect, particularly though not exclusively in the mainstream Christian West." Christopher Beeley, "The Holy Spirit in the Cappadocians: Past and Present," Modern Theology 26:1 (2010), 90.

[44] See Theodor Schermann, *Die Gottheit des heiligen Geistes nach den griechischen Vätern des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg: Herder,1901), 145–67; Paul Galtier, *Le Saint-Esprit en nous d'après les Pères grecs* (Rome: Apud Aedes Universitas Gregorianae, 1946), 175–80. Sykes' commentary, and his clear sighted identification of the unique character of Gregory's thinking apart from Basil, can be found in Donald A. Sykes, ed. and trans., *Gregory of Nazianzus: Poemata Arcana* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 114.

[45] Beeley, *Knowledge*; Christopher Beeley, "The Holy Spirit in Gregory Nazianzen: The pneumatology of Oration 31," in *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Honor of Lloyd Patterson* (ed. Brian Daley et al; Leiden: Brill, 2009); Beeley, "The Holy Spirit."

[46] Beeley, *Knowledge*, 180.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

ideas inform his conclusions, they are a minor part of Beeley's larger project in *Trinity and the Knowledge of God* and he does not dwell on them at great length; also, they are not developed beyond this in his two further articles.[47] While Beeley is concerned to demonstrate the significance of the Spirit to Gregory's theology, Beeley's interpretation of Gregory's pneumatological soteriology is limited by his assignment of "potential salvation" to Christ and "individual salvation" to the Spirit. Neither of these concepts are as fixed in Gregory's thinking as that assessment would suggest.

One area on which there has been an increasing amount of discussion, and which is central to this project, is the idea of θέωσις. To speak of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology is, to many, to speak of deification broadly defined. However, this catch-all language tends to also invoke all the ideas which have adhered to θέωσις in its long history since Gregory coined it.[48] Approaches to the integration of deification, broadly, into Gregory's wider soteriological pneumatology are nearly as common as the different perspectives on deification. Variations on these include Beeley's description of the individualising activity of the Spirit and Opperwall's claims about the novelty of Gregory's integration of deification in baptism.[49] Although he principally locates salvation in the work of Christ, Winslow's *Dynamics of Salvation* has been a central text for readings of deification in Gregory. While it did understate the role of the Spirit, Winslow strongly contributed to the axiomatic understanding of the Spirit's activity in salvation as individualising.[50] Winslow's thinking is strongly beholden to that of Lossky on the subject of θέωσις. As a consequence, both of these figures, and many of those who followed on from them, broadly equate it with deification.[51] Russell's widely received study on deification relies heavily on Winslow when it comes to Nazianzus and further picks up on the idea of individualisation. Russell characterises Gregory's use of deification language as purely metaphorical, but gives low priority to what Winslow referred to as the "corporate and social" dimensions of θέωσις and what Russell himself described as the "realistic

[47] Beeley, "The Holy Spirit," 90–91 is something of an exception. Beeley is particularly concerned with distinguishing the pneumatologies of the three Cappadocians there, and offers a number of comments concerning the function of the church in those systems.

[48] A problem only amplified by the use of "deification" as a totalising translation for θέωσις. On Gregory's fondness for neologisms see Frederick Norris, "Gregory Contemplating the Beautiful: Knowing Human Misery and Divine Mystery through and Being Persuaded by Images," in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (ed. Jostein Børtnes et al; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006, 33, n. 40.

[49] Beeley, *Knowledge*, 178; Opperwall, "Holy Spirit," 213.

[50] Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, 87.

[51] Ibid., 130. See also Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976), 196–216.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

approach."[52] Russell acknowledges, but does not consider significant, Gregory's coining of θέωσις, and saw Athanasius as having laid down the groundwork on which Gregory built, with his real contribution having been in advancing deification as "the moral life and making much greater use of the Platonic tradition in saying it."[53] This conclusion, taken up though not entirely accepted in later literature on Gregory, has been firmly challenged by Maslov. His contention is that Gregory is perhaps less beholden to Platonism than to Stoicism and that his unique use of θέωσις expresses a different idea than that put forward by Irenaeus or Athanasius. This has only been further developed by Elm at this time.[54]

Simply put, despite the relative paucity of scholarly material on Gregory's pneumatology as such, areas closely related to it have seen significant development. This results in a sort of self-perpetuating cycle in which there is little cause or resource for soteriological studies to support moving beyond the Christological elements of Gregory's soteriology because of the paucity of scholarship concerning his pneumatology. As it is, any effort to explore Gregory's soteriological pneumatology is an attempt to address a clearly delineated area that nevertheless requires a broad view of Gregory's thought and the historical trajectories that preceded it.

Chapter 1 will address two questions of background. First, it will establish a synchronic image of Gregory's theological project as principally Trinitarian, concerned with salvation, and conditioned by an approach to knowledge of the divine that begins in the economic revelation of the Father in scripture. Understanding Gregory's theological investments, particularly as they concern the relationship of the persons of the Trinity and, in turn, how that understanding relates to the believer, is necessary background for the project. The second half of this chapter will examine, in broad terms, four other accounts of soteriological pneumatology from the fourth century: Marcellus of Ancyra, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius of Alexandria, and Didymus of Alexandria. While there is no case to be made for Gregory having had a direct connection to any of these figures, they shared the same influences and sources, and their own constructions help give a sense of how Gregory's own arrived against the background of recent thought on the role of the Spirit in salvation.

In Chapter 2, examination of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology will start with an analysis of sections of some of his earliest orations and letters.

---

[52] Norman Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 224.

[53] Ibid., 225.

[54] Maslov, "Limits of Platonism," 441. See also Susanna Elm, "Gregory of Nazianzus: Mediation Between Individual and Community," in *Group Identity in Late Antiquity* (ed. Éric Rebillard et al; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2015), 96.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

This chapter will examine the language Gregory used in his earliest reflection on soteriological pneumatology, but this will also help establish that he is talking about soteriological pneumatology at all in his early period. These early works are where the defining features of Gregory's later soteriological pneumatology were worked out. While moving chronologically, this chapter will address three areas: the nature of metaphor in Gregory's early thought, the consequences for reading θέωσις and soteriology language more broadly, and finally a consideration of the pastoral application of this language. This exercise of moving through his works chronologically permits the logic of the development of his soteriological pneumatology to be put forward clearly. In so doing, the natural course of any development is preserved: later works build on earlier works gradually.

Chapter 3, building on the analysis of Gregory's language in Chapter 2, will focus on Gregory's episcopal orations and the epistolary works around them. These works have often been commented on for their clear presentation of Gregory's theology, or as a resource for Gregory's disputes with Basil. Here they will be explored with a particular view towards what they say about soteriological pneumatology and how Gregory conceived of it as part of his theological project. The dispute with Basil, ostensibly over his failure to declare the Spirit God, will also be considered in light of Basil's letters and his *Homily* 15, which were composed in the same period. This will enable a direct comparison between the soteriological pneumatology on either side of the supposed divide, which will in turn give a much stronger sense of what Gregory sought to defend.

Chapter 4 concerns the first of Gregory's Constantinopolitan orations, as well as the *Theological Orations*, and sees the open deployment and defence of the soteriological pneumatology that Gregory had formulated, by his own admission, in the security of the smaller community in Nazianzus. This broadening of scope naturally brings forward the question of the church and its relationship to Gregory's soteriological pneumatology. The chapter will establish how Gregory's ecclesiology proceeds from his soteriological pneumatology by examining Gregory's understanding of the individual in relation to the church, how his earlier linguistic innovations shape his conception of church leadership, and finally how his broader soteriological programme is conditioned by initial pneumatological investments.

Chapter 5 is concerned with Gregory's mature works from his last year in Constantinople, his early poetry, and final orations. This chapter will address how Gregory argued for the location of holiness, that is, the source of sanctification, salvation, and illumination entirely to the Spirit, by intimation in *Or.* 31, and then openly in his mature thought. It will also address the problem of Gregory's autobiographical poetry and the apparent lack of pneumatological references to be found there, before turning to his final orations and a review of how Gregory, in his final years, considered his early years in strictly

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

pneumatological but also soteriological terms. While this is sometimes seen as a recasting, this project will argue that it is instead a vindication and expansion of the arguments he made throughout his whole career, as laid out in the preceding four chapters.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Chapter 1

Salvation and the Spirit in the Fourth Century

This chapter will locate Gregory's theological programme, the place of his soteriological pneumatology within it, and its place on fourth-century trajectories of the same. The first half will consist of an examination of Gregory's Trinitarianism, addressing fundamental questions necessary for the rest of the project. It outlines the basics of Gregory's thought on the persons of the Trinity. Gregory's understanding of the persons of the Trinity is inextricably connected to their economic action and to the salvation of humanity. The particular roles played by the Father, Son, and Spirit, as well as their shared action, will be considered with respect to establishing the contours of what Gregory would affirm as multiplicity of number while maintaining unity of nature, and preserving the authenticity of economic revelation. This will be further developed by establishing how human knowledge of the Trinity is achieved, and whether this validates speaking of a particular role for the Spirit in salvation apart from the Father or Son.

The second half of this chapter is similarly foundational and draws out the basic shape of how the soteriological role of the Spirit was conceived of in the fourth century. Given the constraints of space, this is a necessarily brief encounter, intended to establish that the Spirit was understood in this way at all as much to illuminate the thought of individual figures. The idea that the Cappadocians were somehow innovators is countered by a review of four significant theologians. Marcellus of Ancyra, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius of Alexandria, and Didymus of Alexandria, to greater or lesser degrees, exhibit similarities to each other and to Gregory in how they conceived of the Spirit acting to effect human salvation.

A. Mind and the Trinity

While the core aim of this section is to establish the basic shape of some of Gregory's Trinitarian investments, the primary focus will be on the relationship between the persons of the Trinity and how humanity relates to the Trinity in turn. The intent in doing so is to start shifting attention from the abstract to the particular: from the persons of the Trinity to their actions, and to the action of the Spirit specifically.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

I. Monarchy and Creation

Elm's point is well made when she states that baptism is "intrinsically related to each author's cosmology. This cosmology in turn reflected his interpretation of salvation and the human capacity to achieve it."[1] Gregory's cosmology, and indeed his Trinitarianism is, even if not necessarily reflective, undeniably understood in tension with his anthropology. Interpolating his *Carm*. 1.1.7 and a relevant passage from his *Or*. 38 gives a fair summary.

Out of nothing, the "Word of Mind [Νοῦ Λόγος]," "adhering to the will of the Father [ἑσπόμενος μεγάλοιο νόῳ Πατρός]," spoke and composed the world.[2] Into this world was introduced the "mortal form of the immortal image [Βροτὸς ἀθανατοιο εἰκών]," the first-born man.[3] Humanity was a composite creature, composed of earth and formless divinity, which Gregory identified as spirit (πνεῦμα).[4] Therefore, as Gregory puts it, "Thus I have affection for one of the ways of life because of my earthly component, while I have in my heart a longing for the other life through the divine part in me."[5] The divine part ruled over of this composite being. However, given free will and the Law, humanity violated divine edict and was cast out of paradise to be clothed in "heavy flesh [παχυτέραν σάρκα]."[6] This new body, with flesh and soul mingled in an "unseen [ἀΐστως]" manner, restricts the soul. The soul nevertheless retains "intellectual ownership [νοερὴν λάχεν]."[7] Howev-

[1] Susanna Elm, "Inscriptions and Conversions: Gregory of Nazianzus on Baptism (Or. 38–40)," in *Conversion in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Seeing and Believing* (Rochester: Rochester University Press, 2003), 2.

[2] *Carm*. 1.1.7.55–56, trans. Sykes, *Poemata Arcana*, 36–37. Note the use of an Epic second declension genitive singular in μεγάλοιο, and ἀθανατοιο in the following quotation. This is characteristic of much of Gregory's poetry.

[3] *Carm*. 1.1.7.74–75; 78, trans. Sykes, *Poemata Arcana*, 36–38. Βροτός carries a number of connotations of mortal humanity, but Sykes' translation is presented here.

[4] *Carm*. 1.1.7.73, ibid.

[5] Τοὔνεκα καὶ βιότων τὸν μὲν στέργω διὰ γαῖαν, τοῦ δ' ἔρον ἐν στήθεσσιν ἔχω θείαν διὰ μοίρην. *Carm*. 1.1.7.76–77, ibid. Though he does not cite it as an example, this illustrates point Grant Macaskill makes about the importance of the "gift of the Holy Spirit" well. Macaskill's reference to participation language is not directly applicable to Gregory. See Grant Macaskill, *Union with Christ in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 72.

[6] *Or*. 38.12, SC 358, 130. On the breadth of this model, see Paul Collins, "Between Creation and Salvation: Theosis and Theurgy," in *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*, vol. 2 (ed. Stephen Finlan et al; Eugene: Pickwick, 2011), 195–96.

[7] *Carm*. 1.1.7.79; 91, trans. Sykes, *Poemata Arcana*, 38. An important distinction must be made between reason and mind in Gregory's thought. Børtnes' summary of the scholarship is effective in this: Νοῦς is closer to cognition, while νόησις is examination of what that produces. See Jostein Børtnes, "Rhetoric and Mental Images in Gregory," in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (ed. Jostein Børtnes et al; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006), 55; *Carm*. 1.2.34.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

er, the perfect balance between body and soul had been disrupted to such an extent that no redress seemed possible, with humanity requiring a decisive act on the part of the Godhead to realise the possibility of restoring the image of God in humanity.[8] The act of creation, of the world and of humanity, is expressed in terms that depend on an understanding of the relationship between the persons of the Trinity and of what it means for them to will, and to follow the will of another. In turn, a grasp of harmonious Trinitarian willing is necessary to understand the redemption of humanity, whose salvation is at least partly contingent on the resolution of conflicting wills arising from disharmony between soul and body.

Will in the Trinity is inextricable from divine causality in Gregory's understanding of the Trinity. That is to say, the means by which the Son and Spirit are generated; begetting and procession, as contrasted with the Father as first cause, uncaused, or source. The internal ordering of the Trinity is the essential framework upon which all other elements of Gregory's Trinitarian thought depend, and by extension the relationship between Trinity and human salvation.[9]

Gregory laid out a condensed form of his view of divine causality in *Or*. 25.15:

> Define too for us our orthodox faith by teaching us to recognise one God, unbegotten, the Father, and one begotten Lord, his Son, referred to as God when he is mentioned separately, but Lord when he is named in conjunction with the Father, the one term on account of his nature, the other on account of his monarchy; and one Holy Spirit proceeding, or, if you will, going forth from the Father, God to those with the capacity to apprehend things that are interrelated, but in fact resisted by the impious though so recognised by their

[8] *Or*. 38.12–13. For more on the philosophical background of Gregory's exegesis of Genesis, see Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Gregory of Nazianzus: Rhetor and Philosopher* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 135–36. Ruether offers a dense but accessible account of the philosophical underpinnings of Gregory's exegesis of Genesis. Some care must be taken with Ruether's preceding account of Gregory's cosmology and anthropology. While perfectly sound in most respects, it suffers from a sole reliance on *Or*. 38, and the lack of *Carm*. 1.1.7 to provide linguistic and conceptual precision to the analysis. Ibid., 130–35. Beyond this, some of her conclusions on Gregory's grasp of the relationship of philosophy to Christianity are contestable. On this see Frederick Norris, "Of Thorns and Roses: The Logic of Belief in Gregory Nazianzen," *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 53 (1984): 455–64.

[9] See Christopher Beeley, "Divine Causality and the Monarchy of God the Father in Gregory of Nazianzus" *Harvard Theological Review* 100:2 (2007), 199–214. The main interlocutors on the subject as identified by Beeley are Eginhard P. Meijering, "The Doctrine of the Will and the Trinity in the Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus," *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 27.3 (1973); Norris, *Faith Gives Fullness*, 45, 136–37, 176, 199; Hanson, *Search*, 713; Thomas F. Torrance, *Trinitarian Faith*, 319–22; also Richard Cross, "Divine Monarchy in Gregory of Nazianzus," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 14.1 (2005), 114, 116; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 244–45. See also Beeley, *Knowledge*, 209, n. 67–68.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

betters and actually so predicated by the more spiritual. Neither should we place the Father beneath first principle, so as to avoid positing a first of the first, thus necessarily destroying primary existence; nor say that the Son or the Holy Spirit is without beginning. Thus we shall avoid depriving the Father of his special characteristic. Paradoxically, they are not without beginning, and, in a sense, they are: they are not in terms of causation, since they are indeed from God although they are not subsequent to him, just as light is not subsequent to the sun, but they are without beginning in terms of time since they are not subject to it.[10]

The Father is established as the uncaused first principle from which the Son and Spirit are eternally generated outside of time. Although generated, the Son and Spirit retain the divinity of their source and share in one Godhead. However, the modes of generation of Son and Spirit are distinguished from each other. The Son is begotten, whereas the Spirit proceeds from the Father without being differentiated in time. Although they are distinguished from each other linguistically, Gregory located the content of the distinction outside human comprehension: "What, then, is 'proceeding'? You explain the ingeneracy of the Father, and I will give you a biological account of the Son's begetting and the Spirit's proceeding – and let us go mad the pair of us for prying into God's secrets."[11] Their content is thus rendered less significant than their implication. He went on in this vein: "The very facts of not being begotten, of being begotten and of proceeding, give them whatever names are applied to them – Father, Son, and Holy Spirit respectively. The aim is to safeguard the distinctiveness of the three hypostases within the single nature

[10] *Or*. 25.15, *The Fathers of the Church: St Gregory of Nazianzus: Select Orations* (trans. Martha Vinson; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University Press of America, 2003), 170–71. See also Beeley, *Knowledge*, 205–6 for a credal reconstruction of this text and and a more extensive analysis. SC 284, 192–94. Ὁρίζου δὲ καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν εὐσέβειαν, διδάσκων ἕνα μὲν εἰδέναι Θεὸν ἀγέννητον, τὸν Πατέρα· ἕνα δὲ γεννητὸν Κύριον, τὸν Υἱόν· Θεὸν μέν, ὅταν καθ' ἑαυτὸν λέγηται, προσαγορευόμενον· Κύριον δὲ, ὅταν μετὰ Πατρὸς ὀνομάζηται· τὸ μὲν διὰ τὴν φύσιν, τὸ δὲ διὰ τὴν μοναρχίαν. Ἓν δὲ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, προελθὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἢ καὶ προϊόν· Θεὸν, τοῖς νοητῶς νοοῦσι τὰ παρακείμενα· τοῖς μὲν ἀσεβέσι καὶ πολεμούμενον, τοῖς δὲ ὑπὲρ τούτους νοούμενον, τοῖς πνευματικωτέροις δὲ καὶ λεγόμενον. Μήτε ὑπὸ ἀρχὴν ποιεῖν τὸν Πατέρα, ἵνα μὴ τοῦ πρώτου τι πρῶτον εἰσαγάγωμεν, ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὸ εἶναι πρώτῳ περιτραπήσεται· μήτε ἄναρχον τὸν Υἱὸν ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἵνα μὴ τὸ Πατρὸς ἴδιον περιέλωμεν. Οὐκ ἄναρχα γὰρ, καὶ ἀναρχά πως· ὃ καὶ παράδοξον. Οὐκ ἄναρχα μὲν γὰρ τῷ αἰτίῳ· ἐκ Θεοῦ γὰρ, εἰ καὶ μὴ μετ' αὐτὸν, ὡς ἐξ ἡλίου φῶς· ἄναρχα δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ. Οὐ γὰρ ὑπὸ χρόνον, ἵνα μὴ τὸ ῥέον ᾖ τῶν ἑστώτων πρεσβύτερον, καὶ τῶν οὐσιῶν τὸ ἀνούσιον.

[11] *Or*. 31.8, trans. Lionel Wickham et al, *On God and Christ: The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius*, Popular Patristics Series 23 (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002), 122. SC 250, 290. Τίς οὖν ἡ ἐκπόρευσις; Εἰπὲ σὺ τὴν ἀγεννησίαν τοῦ Πατρός, κἀγὼ τὴν γέννησιν τοῦ Υἱοῦ φυσιολογήσω, καὶ τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ παραπληκτίσομεν ἄμφω εἰς Θεοῦ μυστήρια παρακύπτοντες.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

and quality of the Godhead."[12] Lossky, in treating with this passage, identifies it as an act of apophatic theology, and that any further movement towards relations of source as anything but expressions of "inexpressible diversity" is an act of de-personalisation.

Gregory would seem to have differed on this, in that the end of *Or*. 31.9 engaged in cataphasis and openly confirmed that causal distinction establishes identity in the Trinity. While the mode of generation may be inexpressible, for Gregory the diversity within the Trinity certainly was not.[13] This distinction establishes that the members of the Trinity are uniquely who they are but share what they are with each other. This distinction was necessary for Gregory, who himself emphasised that the unity which he defended was not one of a Sabellian monad, but one in which the Son, Spirit, and Father exist as equal in essence, but distinct to the point of paradox.[14]

Although this appears to be a rather weak approach to unity on the part of a theologian whose present-day reputation is one of a robust assertion of the Trinity, Gregory addressed this problem directly: "Do not put yourself alongside the Trinity, lest you be banished from the Trinity. Do not truncate the single and equally august nature at any point. Because whichever of the Trinity you destroy, you will have destroyed the whole – or rather, you will have been banished from the whole. It is better to have a meagre idea of union than to venture on total blasphemy."[15] This should not be read so far as to imply an affirmation of weak divine unity on Gregory's part. However, this does represent an attempt on his part to claim ground against opponents who are ranking the Spirit with themselves, cutting off one or another from the Godhead, and thus overthrowing the whole, so to speak. This is a reduced unity by the standards of later theology, but on the basis of context it is one that was necessary to Gregory's larger project. To disregard it distorts the realities of Gregory's view of the inter-relation of the members of the Trinity, and particularly the relation between the Son and the Spirit.

Simply put, for Gregory, there existed three distinct identities in the Trinity, distinguished in number and by causal relation but equal in essence and

[12] *Or*. 31.9, trans. Wickham, 123. SC 250, 292. αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ μὴ γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ τὸ γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἐκπορεύεσθαι, τὸν μὲν πατέρα, τὸν δὲ υἱόν, τὸ δὲ τοῦθ' ὅπερ λέγεται πνεῦμα ἅγιον προσηγόρευσεν, ἵνα τὸ ἀσύγχυτον σώζηται τῶν τριῶν ὑποστάσεων ἐν τῇ μιᾷ φύσει τε καὶ ἀξίᾳ τῆς θεότητος.

[13] See Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 79. See also *Or*. 39.11.

[14] *Or*. 25.17. See Thomas A. Noble "Paradox in Gregory Nazianzen's Doctrine of the Trinity," StPatr 27 (1993), 94.

[15] *Or*. 31.12, trans. Wickham, 126. SC 250, 300. Μηδὲν μετὰ σαυτοῦ θῇς τῆς Τριάδος, μὴ τῆς Τριάδος ἐκπέσῃς. Μηδενὶ περικόψῃς τὴν μίαν φύσιν καὶ ὁμοίως σεβάσμιον, ὡς ὅ τι ἂν τῶν τριῶν καθέλῃς, τὸ πᾶν ἔσῃ καθῃρηκώς, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ παντὸς ἐκπεπτωκώς. Βέλτιον μικρὰν τῆς ἑνώσεως φαντασίαν λαβεῖν, ἢ παντελῆ τολμῆσαι δυσσέβειαν.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

glory.[16] This gave priority to the Father as cause, which did not distress Gregory, who wrote of the Father that, "I wish to call the Father greater, for from him are the equals and the being of equals."[17] He was reluctant to do so only on the basis that such an assertion would be misinterpreted as introducing inequality into the Godhead. Crucially, although the Father holds priority as cause it is not a priority of being which reduces the other members of the Trinity to subsequent or creaturely status, for "[t]he three are God with mutual reflection, each God because of the consubstantiality, one God because of the *monarchia*. As soon as I conceive of the one, I am illumined by the splendour of the three; as soon as I distinguish the three than I am carried back to the one."[18] The monarchy of the Father enables the unity of the Trinity, rather than undermining it. It is the common referent of the divine essence that brings about the unity of the Trinity.[19]

The productive Father generates the Son and Spirit, who in turn refer back to their source, bringing about a unity of essence and will. It is especially important to draw out what Gregory wrote in *Or*. 40.41. Any reference to the one returns to three, just as distinguishing among the three returns to one. Thus, strong distinction is made possible by its constant reference back to the oneness of the shared Godhead, to the same extent that it is possible to conceive of one Godhead because of the causal distinction within it.[20] As Beeley put it, "The monarchy of the Father is the foundational principle of trinitarian logic and the fundamental dynamic that contains and gives meaning to the grammatical aspects of consubstantial unity and relational distinctness."[21] With this principle of weak unity permitting strong distinction which in turn establishes strong unity – derived from the foundational role of the monarchy of the Father and the significance of the modes of generation – it is possible to consider how Gregory conceived of the wills of persons so distinguished.

II. Movement and Identity

Gregory's understanding of intellect in the Trinity depends on this shift between weak and strong unity on the basis of generation and monarchy. This

[16] See especially *Or*. 29.2.

[17] *Or*. 40.43. SC 358, 298. Θέλω τὸν Πατέρα μείζω εἰπεῖν, ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὸ ἴσοις εἶναι, τοῖς ἴσοις ἐστὶ, καὶ τὸ εἶναι.

[18] *Or*. 40.41. SC 358, 294. Θεὸν τὰ τρία σὺν ἀλλήλοις νοούμενα, ἐκεῖνο διὰ τὴν ὁμοουσιότητα, τοῦτο διὰ τὴν μοναρχίαν. Οὐ φθάνω τὸ ἓν νοῆσαι καὶ τοῖς τρισὶ περιλάμπομαι· οὐ φθάνω τὰ τρία διελεῖν καὶ εἰς τὸ ἓν ἀναφέρομαι.

[19] For another detailed consideration of the topic see Nathan Jacobs, "On 'Not Three Gods' – Again: Can a Primary-Secondary Substance Reading of Ousia and Hypostasis Avoid Tritheism?" *Modern Theology* 24, no. 3 (2008): 331–58.

[20] See John P. Egan, "Toward Trinitarian Perichoresis: Saint Gregory the Theologian, Oration 31.14," StPatr 27 (1993), 21–29.

[21] Beeley, "Divine Causality," 209.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

has often been obfuscated due to a misunderstanding of Gregory's view of divine causality or a misappropriation of Nyssen or Basil's views into a Cappadocian whole.[22] Gregory relies on monarchy and differentiation by generation when he sets out his case for there being multiple intellects. In a similar fashion, while he asserts differentiation by intellect, he argues for unity on the basis of an identity of nature and movement. The integrity of these intellects is maintained by the absence of a reference to any identity of action in *Or*. 23, where Gregory wrote of, "Lives and life, lights and light, goods and good, glories and glory; true and truth and Spirit of truth, holy ones and holiness itself; each one is God if contemplated alone, with the intellect dividing undivided entities; the three are contemplated as one God through their identity of movement and nature, when apprehended with each other."[23] Movement (κίνημα) has not yet made an appearance in the passages already examined. First, Gregory established movement as a distinct category of divine identity: "Eternity is neither time nor a portion of time – for it is not measurable – just as time measured by the sun is for us, the eternal is for those everlasting – a temporal movement and interval coextensive with these beings."[24] Written in the context of human apprehension of shared divine attributes, this allows us to shed some light on the earlier use of κινήσεως in *Or.* 23.11. Gregory clearly had an idea of movement-as-eternality constituting a shared

[22] See in particular Verna Harrison "Illumined from All Sides by the Trinity: Neglected Themes in Gregory's Trinitarian Theology," in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (ed. Christopher Beeley; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2009), 13–14 for a response to these misapprehensions. Although she acknowledges the limitations of her work it is a lucid assessment. In addition to Harrison's points, two of the interlocutors she identifies as overstating Gregory's view of divine unity, Ayres, *Nicaea*, 279–301 and Michel René Barnes, "One Nature, One Power: Consensus Doctrine in Pro-Nicene Polemic," StPatr 29 (1997), 205–23; 220 also operate from a position which assigns greater emphasis to unity in the Godhead on a causal basis.

[23] Or. 23.11, trans. Harrison, "Illuminated," 17. SC 270, 302. ζωὰς καὶ ζωήν, φῶτα καὶ φῶς, ἀγαθὰ καὶ ἀγαθόν, δόξας κὰι δόξαν, ἀληθινὸν καὶ ἀλήθειαν καὶ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ἅγια καὶ αὐτοαγιότητα· Θεὸν ἕκαστον, ἂν θεωρῆται μόνον, τοῦ νοῦ χωρίζοντος τὰ ἀχώριστα· Θεὸν τὰ τρία, μετ᾽ ἀλλήλων νοούμενα τῷ ταυτῷ τῆς κινήσεως καὶ τῆς φύσεως·

[24] *Or*. 38.8. SC 358, 118. Αἰὼν γὰρ οὔτε χρόνος οὔτε χρόνου τι μέρος – οὐδὲ γὰρ μετρητόν –, ἀλλ᾽ ὅπερ ἡμπιν ὁ χρόνος, ἡλίου φορᾷ μετρούμενος, τοῦτο τοῖς ἀϊδίοις αἰών, τὸ συμπαρεκτεινόμενον τοῖς οὖσιν, οἷόν τι χρονικὸν κίνημα καὶ διάστημα. On the probable source for συμπαρεκτεινόμενον in Origen, and his sources, see Panayiotis Tzamalikos, *Anaxagoras, Origen, and Neoplatonism: The Legacy of Anaxagoras to Classical and Late Antiquity* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 978. Further context for *Or*. 38.8, and its possible significations for divine hiddenness are explored in Dragoş A. Giulea, "The Divine Essence, That Inaccessible Kabod Enthroned in Heaven: Nazianzen's *Oratio* 28, 3 and the Tradition of Apophatic Theology from Symbols to Philosophical Concepts Introduction: Nazianzen's Text and Its Twofold Background," Numen 57 (2010): 21.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

divine attribute. Second, *Or*. 31.6 opposes the idea that κίνημα and ἐνέργεια were interchangeable for Gregory: "If an activity, it [the Spirit] must be activated, because he has no active power and ceases with the cessation of his production – that is the kind of thing an activity is. How comes it then that he does act? He says things, he decrees, he is grieved, he is vexed – all of which belong to a being with motion, not to the process of motion."[25] With both terms used in close proximity, movement in *Or*. 31.6 is obviously not the technical usage seen in *Ors*. 38.8 or 23.11. However, the metaphor could hardly be said to work if movement and activity were interchangeable technical terms.[26]

Harrison also begins her discussion with *Or*. 23.11. She makes a minor but significant assumption regarding κινήσεως. She writes that, "he [Gregory] surely means... activity." Harrison goes on to mount an excellent argument as to why this apparent identity of activity in the Trinity does not encroach on Trinitarian individuation. However, such an attempt at resolution is unnecessary. Activity and movement are not the same. As demonstrated above, Gregory allows for strong individuation on the basis of shared movement and nature, both suggestive of derivation from the eternal Father.[27] There is no restriction of individuation by identity of activity because Gregory does not propose one.[28]

On this basis, the force motivating to action, intellect, or reason (νόος), is a point of distinction rather than one of identity. Gregory offers some greater clarity on this front. That it is possible to make such divisions does not imply that there is strife or disagreement in the Godhead:

> We have one God because there is a single Godhead. Though there are three objects of belief, they derive from the single whole and have reference to it. They do not have degrees of being God or degrees of priority over against one another. They are not sundered in will [βουλήσει, not νόος] or divided in power. You cannot find there any of the properties inherent in things divisible. To express it succinctly, the Godhead exists undivided in beings divided. It is as if there were a single intermingling of light, which existed in three mutually connected suns.[29]

[25] *Or*. 31.6, trans. Wickham, 121. SC 250, 286. εἰ ἐνέργεια, ἐνεργηθήσεται δῆλονότι, οὐκ ἐνεργήσει, καὶ ὁμοῦ τῷ ἐνεργηθῆναι παύσεται. Τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἡ ἐνέργεια. Πῶς οὖν ἐνεργεῖ, καὶ τάδε λέγει, καὶ ἀφορίζει, καὶ λυπεῖται, καὶ παροξύνεται, καὶ ὅσα κινουμένου σαφῶς ἐστίν, οὐ κινήσεως;

[26] See also *Or*. 29.2 and Harrison, "Illuminated," 23 for another example of atemporal movement identified by Harrison.

[27] See *Or*. 38.8. Also Harrison, "Illuminated," 17–18.

[28] The possibility of a counter to this in *Or*. 31 is diffused on the basis that the limited identity of operations Gregory does allow is "an element of spiritual exegesis," consistent with the movement from one to the other in contemplation. Beeley, *Knowledge*, 182.

[29] *Or*. 31.14, trans. Wickham, 127. SC 250, 303–4. See Harrison, "Illuminated," 21 on Gregory's two-fold approach to conceptualisation of the Godhead. Ἡμῖν εἷς Θεός, ὅτι

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Gregory's argument for the Trinity goes some way to demonstrating the complexity of his position on the unity of will. It is easy to read this as an affirmation of identity of will. What Gregory meant by the qualities that define divisible things is ambiguous. Certainly, humanity is defined by a lack of unanimity of will as much by a lack of identity of will. However, when seen in light of the previous discussion, Gregory's argument reveals itself more clearly as for agreement of will and identity of power, that is, of the nature from which power is derived.[30] Writing in the *Fifth Theological Oration*, Gregory fully discloses this with the construction that the Father, the Son, and the "other comforter [ἄλλος παράκλητος]," was the "true light which lights every man [ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον]."[31] Just as Gregory's description of creation has the Son following the will of the Father without compromising his individuality or being subservient to that will, so too do all members of the Trinity act unanimously in a way that is consistent with their own intellect. That such a sentiment, distinction implying unity, should seem paradoxical is consistent with Gregory's view of divine causality. The differentiation by generation of the persons itself moves the believer back to contemplation of unity.

When movement, activity, and intellect are properly distinguished, it is this divisible intellect that manifests divine action in the economy, as revealed to the created order. This interpretation sits in contrast with that put forward in Narkevics. He writes, "there is one nature and creative power, one will and mind of the triune God (these are the essential attributes of the Trinity) […]."[32] Narkevics' assessment is derived from an interpretation of *Or*. 29.2 and a reading of γνώμης σύμπνοια as identifying one mind. On the contrary *Or*. 23.11, which uses the less general νόος, supports McGuckin's reading of *Or*. 31: "They [the Apologists] had advanced the notion of unity from alignment of will; for Gregory, it is the other way around, insofar as

μία θεότης· καὶ πρὸς ἓν τὰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἔχει, κἂν τρία πιστεύηται. Οὐ γὰρ τὸ μὲν μᾶλλον, τὸ δὲ ἧττον Θεός· οὐδὲ τὸ μὲν πρότερον, τὸ δὲ ὕστερον· οὐδὲ βουλήσει τέμνεται, οὐδὲ δυνάμει μερίζεται, οὐδέ τι τῶν ὅσα τοῖς μεριστοῖς ὑπάρχει, κἀνταῦθα λαβεῖν ἔστίν· ἀλλ' ἀμέριστος ἐν μεμερισμένοις, εἰ δεῖ συντόμως εἰπεῖν, ἡ θεότης· καὶ οἷον ἐν ἡλίοις τρισὶν ἐχομένοις ἀλλήλων, μία τοῦ φωτὸς σύγκρασις.

[30] Ayres' contributions are useful, if not perfectly applicable to Gregory of Nazianzus. Attribution, broadly defined as it is in Ayres, is an acceptable characterisation of the unanimity of will described here. However, it would be inappropriate to assert Gregory allowed for an identity of action or intellects. Instead, Gregory's strong unanimity returns the believer to an understanding of effective unity that does not "import distinctions that we observe between objects in the material world." Ayres, *Nicaea*, 296–97.

[31] *Or*. 31.3 by way of Jn 1.9. SC 250, 280.

[32] Edgar Narkevics, "*Skiagraphia*: Outlining the Conception of God in Gregory's *Theological Orations*," in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (ed. J. Bortnes and T. Hagg; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006), 108–9, n. 56.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

commonality of being demands synonymity of will."[33] For Gregory, there are three intellects in the Trinity. By their shared nature, however, they are in perfect unanimity and never at variance. It is possible for Gregory to speak of actions that are unique or distinctive to each person, without compromising equality or unity.[34] Such a model is especially necessary when Gregory's view of the Trinity is expanded to include its relationship to creation.

III. Knowledge and the Spirit

The key elements of Gregory's Trinitarian thought, relevant to this project, are that there are three distinct intellects that share a divine nature. Their identity of nature and movement permits a strong distinction which is capable of allowing particular actions with respect to individual members of the Trinity, without compromising unity through the unanimous agreement of will. The identity of nature prevents this understanding of the Trinity from suggesting composition. This distinction between the persons of the Trinity carries through and frames Gregory's cosmological construction of human salvation. The passage of knowledge from the Trinity to that humanity is oriented around Pentecost and the arrival of the Spirit, which permits the resolution of the conflicting natures in humanity. It is on this model of Trinitarian relations that the validity of a unique soteriological role for the Spirit, with respect to Gregory's Trinity, will be considered.

Gregory himself disclosed the reason why there is not a constant emphasis on the action of the Spirit: "Nor is the more complete account [of the Spirit] appropriate for beginners. Who ever exposes the full beams of fire to eyes still weak or overstrains them with excessive light?"[35] Gregory pointed towards a similar theme in his *Fifth Theological Oration*, noting the particular difficulty of the Spirit.[36] Despite these difficulties in locating the third intellect of the Trinity, Gregory does have much to say on the identification of the Spirit and of the actions unique to it. In an extensive disclosure of the titles and capacities of the Spirit, which is worth quoting at length, Gregory wrote it directly:

---

[33] John McGuckin, "'Perceiving Light from Light in Light (Oration 31.3)' The Trinitarian Theology of Saint Gregory the Theologian," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 39:1, 21. Although not explored here, on the wider peculiarities of *Or*. 29.2 see the excellent summary and argument in Ruth Majercik, "A Reminiscence of the Chaldean Oracles at Gregory of Nazianzus *Or*. 29, 2: *Oion Krater Tis Hupererrue*," *VC* 52 (1998): 286–92.

[34] Effectively returning to a kind of appropriation as identified by Ayres, *Nicaea*, 296.

[35] *Carm*. 1.1.3.19–21, trans. Sykes, *Poemata Arcana*, 10. οὐδε γὰρ ἀρχομένοισι τελειοτέροιο λόγοιο καιρός. τίς δ' ἀμυδροῖσιν ἔτ' ὄμμασιν ἢ πυρὸς αὐγὰς δεῖξεν ὅλας ἢ φωτὸς ἀπληστοτέροιο κόρεσσεν;

[36] *Or*. 31.2.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

He is called "Spirit of God," "Spirit of Christ," "Mind of Christ," "Spirit of the Lord," and "Lord" absolutely; "Spirit of Adoption," "of Truth," "of Freedom"; "Spirit of Wisdom," "Understanding," "Counsel," "Might," "Knowledge," "True Religion" and of "The Fear of God." [...] The "finger of God," he is, like God, "a fire," which proves, I think, that he is consubstantial.[37]

Three elements in particular need to be drawn out from this dense and allusive passage. First, the identification with Christ is more than merely another allusion to the recursive movement in the Trinity from one to three. It points directly to the role played by the Spirit in the story of the incarnate Son as portrayed in the scripture. Second, the capacitive identification of the Spirit with baptism and resurrection bears two meanings. In addition to the relation it bears to the believer, it also points back to those events in Christ's story, and the Spirit's role in them. Third, in the full flow of capacitive claims at the end of this passage, Gregory repeatedly alludes to functions played by the Spirit in the life of Christ.

What this points to is that, although salvation plays out on the stage of Christ's narrative, the Spirit was never absent from that account. For Gregory, the Spirit necessarily played numerous essential roles beyond the self-referentiality of any divine action. To this end, the Spirit plays the same functions in the life of the believer as in the life of Christ. However, this does not mean that it is impossible to disentangle Gregory's pneumatology and Christology. Hillis posits, "The Spirit's deifying work thus appears to be predicated on the ontological unity the Spirit has with the Son. [...] Gregory does not, however, devote much attention to the specific relationship of the Son and the Spirit, nor does his understanding of human salvation require him to do so."[38] The model of the Trinity laid out above calls the second part of this statement into question. The nature of the differentiation of intellect, and the degree of care Gregory took over it, suggests that the relationship between the persons of the Trinity in the economy was of critical importance to him. However, the first half is problematic on the basis of Gregory's own method: the ontological status of the Spirit is predicated on its deifying work, which in turn is a consequence of its procession from the Father, not from the Son. If the Spirit does not deify, there would be comparatively little cause for Gregory to argue for its divinity, even if it were an activity or energy of the Son. Given Hillis'

[37] *Or*. 31.29, trans. Wickham, 140. SC 250, 334. Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ λέγεται, Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, νοῦς Χριστοῦ, Πνεῦμα Κυρίο, αὐτο Κύριος, Πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας, ἀληθείας, ἐλευθερίας· Πνεῦμα σοφίας, συνέσεως, βουλῆς, ἰσχύος, γνώσεως, εὐσεβείας, φοβοῦ Θεοῦ· […] δάκτυλος Θεοῦ, πῦρ ὡς θεός, εἰς ἔμφασιν, οἶμαι, τοῦ ὁμοουσίου·

[38] Hillis, "Pneumatology and Soteriology," 190.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

otherwise clear summary of the outlines of the role of the Spirit in deification, his characterisation is likely accidental rather than deliberate.[39]

Rather than minimising the contribution of the Spirit, Gregory's emphasis on the life of Christ should instead be seen to be oriented towards granting humanity access to the elevated status possessed by Christ by nature yet achieved by humanity through grace and the Spirit. This is alluded to when Gregory wrote that, "[g]radually the Spirit began to shine for these people, but he reserved the greater part for us, / for whom in later times he was divided in tongues of fire, / bringing a token for his divinity when the Saviour had leapt up from the earth."[40] By moving towards Gregory's understanding of divine causation, will, and intellect in the Trinity, it has been possible to recognise an overlooked facet of his soteriological thought – that Gregory's emphasis on the role of the Spirit in baptism and deification does not arise from nothing, but instead points backwards to the Christ story and the ongoing imitation of the believer. In this is an answer to the question which was set out at the start of this section: whether it is possible to speak discretely of the Spirit in salvation. This is assuredly so on the basis of the manner of Gregory's differentiation of persons. It is possible to speak of the action of the Spirit in salvation precisely because doing so continually draws the believer back to the source of salvation in its entirety in the Trinity as a whole.[41]

In closing the consideration of the relevant elements of Gregory's Trinitarianism, it is necessary to turn to the interface between the believer and the Trinity. All that which Gregory describes in terms of divine operation is openly affirmed as arising out of human contemplation and witness, whereas his discussion of causality is necessarily more mysterious due to the incapacity of human contemplation. Although this may seem out of place, having until now focused on the Godhead, it is an essential element of Gregory's Trinitarian theology.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

[39] Hillis, "Pneumatology and Soteriology," 195–96. As I will show in Chapter 4 Gregory also devotes no small attention to the relationship between the Spirit and Son in the economy.

[40] *Carm*. 1.1.3.29–31, trans. Sykes, *Poemata Arcana*, 12. Βαιὸν τοῖαδ' ὑπέλαμψε, τὸ δὲ πλεόν ἡμὶν ἔλειπεν, οἱς ῥα καὶ ἐν γλώσσῃσι πυρὸς μετέπειτ' ἐμερίσθη, σῆμα φέρον θεότητος, ὅτ' ἐκ χθονὸς ἅλτο Σαωτήρ.

[41] On the benefits of more diverse models on the Trinity, and against those presented by Torrance and Zizioulas, see Najeeb G. Awad, "Between Subordination and Koinonia: Toward a New Reading of the Cappadocian Theology," *Modern Theology* 23, no. 2 (2007): 191–204; 198–99 in particular. Although he is concerned to demonstrate the diversity of the Cappadocians as well, his comments throughout are instructive. See also Zizioulas, J. *Being as Communion* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), 27–49; Torrance, *Trinitarian Faith*, 238–41 per Awad for an example of those arguments he opposed.

For Gregory, the beginning of the contemplative life, θεώρια, finds its beginning in the baptism of the believer.[42] From this initialising moment, the believer is sent into a dynamic movement of purification and illumination that proceeds towards knowledge of the divine. However, a note of caution undergirds this. In the post-baptismal struggle to restore the divine image fused to the creaturely capacities of the believer, the temptation of a shortcut constantly re-asserts itself in the form of using discursive reasoning to arrive at knowledge of the divine.[43] Gregory's caution regarding pursuit of the knowledge of God, particularly by those with enough knowledge to place themselves or others into danger, is explicit; but equally so is his belief that the baptised on the path of illumination can persevere. This is expressed concisely in his oration on baptism, which it is worthwhile to quote at length and to bring into tension with two points from Gregory's writings on the Spirit:

> Accept in addition to this resurrection, judgment, and justice of God's righteous standard: this will be light for whose thought is purified, that is, God seen and known, proportionate to the measure of their purity, which we name the kingdom of heaven; but darkness for those who blind their reason, that is, estrangement from God, proportionate to their dim-sightedness.[44]

The means of this perseverance takes the form of reception of the grace of the Trinity. The Trinity as revealed in contemplation is revealing itself to the baptised, purified and illuminated.[45] However, what is especially crucial is that this self-reference as purification towards knowledge of the Trinity is accomplished through the intercession of the Spirit. This is evident in the *Fifth Theological Oration*:

> And again: "We do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words." And again: "I will pray with the Spirit but I will pray

[42] See Dayna Kalleres, "Demons and Divine Illumination: A Consideration of Eight Prayers by Gregory of Nazianzus," *VC* 61:2 (2007), 169ff for a thorough treatment of the interaction of divine knowledge, human purification, and malefic temptation in Gregory's thought. See also Ruether, *Rhetor and Philosopher*, 138.

[43] Kalleres, "Demons," 174–75.

[44] *Or*. 40.45. Winslow posits that the passage from which the above is selected "spells out in detail the whole scope of God's salvific activity." We should exercise a degree of caution in over-reading Winslow here. While *Or*. 40.45 certainly spells out the scope of God's saving activity in the economy, the passage itself and Winslow's comments on the immediately prior pages all point away from reading *Or*. 40.45 as a blueprint for salvation. See Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, 39, 41. SC 358, 306. Δέχου πρὸς τούτοις ἀνάστασιν, κρίσιν, ἀνταπόδοσιν τοῖς δικαίοις τοῦ Θεοῦ σταθμοῖς. Ταύτην δὲ εἶναι φῶς τοῖς κεκαθαρμένοις τὴν διάνοιαν, τουτέστι Θεὸν ὁρώμενόν τε καὶ γινωσκόμενον, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς καθαρότητος, ὃ δὴ καὶ βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν ὀνομάζομεν· σκότος δὲ τοῖς τυφλώττουσι τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν, τουτέστιν ἀλλοτρίωσιν Θεοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς ἐντεῦθεν ἀμβλυωπίας.

[45] See *Or*. 23.11.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

with the mind also" – meaning, in mind and spirit. Worshipping, then, and praying in the Spirit seem to me to be simply the Spirit presenting prayer and worship to himself.[46]

The Spirit's involvement in actualising the contemplative life of the believer, and by extension all knowledge of the Trinity, is not limited to the initialising moment of baptism. On the contrary, it is the ongoing action of the Spirit in prayer and contemplation that actualises the possibility of knowledge and completes the received image of the Trinity through the Spirit's inclusion. This subject of baptism, human reception and pursuit of knowledge, and the nature of the operation of the Spirit will be returned to repeatedly throughout this study, as it is this very knowledge and imitation that forms the stuff of salvation for Gregory. For now, this brief analysis serves to demonstrate the participatory nature of Trinitarian revelation, which is itself contingent on Gregory's broader Trinitarian theology of multiplicity of number and intellect, and of unity arising from a unanimity of will and an identity of nature and movement.

B. Trajectories in the Fourth Century

I. Soteriological Pneumatologies

With the basic shape of Gregory's soteriological and pneumatological claims in mind, it is possible to turn to the intellectual history of these doctrines and their intersection in Gregory's thought. An exploration of the simple definitions of pneumatological activity in salvation as sustained in early fourth-century theologians shows that Gregory was working against a background of ongoing thought. He can be located as part of a gradual process of development of, and increasing concern for, the activity of the Spirit in the Greco-Roman East. Although Athanasius is consciously acknowledged as a predecessor, little evidence, whether textual or epistolary, exists to support a direct relation. However, it is hardly possible to deny that Athanasius and Gregory existed on the same trajectory. Demonstrating this requires a consideration, in brief, of the basic shape of the action of the Spirit. Marcellus of Ancyra, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius of Alexandria, and Didymus the Blind will be examined here.[47] There are others who could be included, from Origen and

[46] *Or*. 31.12, trans. Wickham, 125–26. SC 250, 298. Καὶ πάλιν· "Τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξόμεθα, καθ' ὃ δεῖ, οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις." Καί, "Προσεύξομαι τῷ Πνεύματι, προσεύξομαι δὲ καὶ τῷ νοΐ," τοῦτ' ἐστίν, ἐν νοΐ καὶ Πνεύματι. Τὸ οὖν προσκυνεῖν τῷ Πνεύματι, ἢ προσεύχεσθαι, οὐδὲν ἄλλο εἶναί μοι φαίνεται, ἢ αὐτὸ ἑαυτῷ τὴν εὐχὴν προσάγειν καὶ τὴν προσκύνησιν.

[47] I am particularly grateful to the work of Francis Gautier for his discussion of the novelty (or not) of Gregory's focus on the divinity of the Spirit. See Francis Gautier, "Gré-

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Gregory Thaumaturgus to Eusebius of Caesarea and Eunomius of Cyzicus, all of whom had an impact either on this trajectory as a whole or its development in Cappadocia with their own concepts of the action of the Spirit.[48] Their absence should not be taken as indicative of their degree of relevance to Gregory. Some, particularly Origen, Thaumaturgus, and Eunomius, had a more direct impact on Gregory than those under consideration here.[49] However, they were not as concerned to establish a positive soteriological pneumatology as those mentioned above. In establishing his credentials as a defender of the Spirit, Gregory is concerned to locate himself on a Nicene trajectory as a matter of legitimacy.[50] Whether or not he had direct access to the texts of others in this trajectory is less significant than that these figures give a sense of the kind of positions being set out immediately prior to Gregory's own.[51]

---

goire l'innovateur? Tradition et innovation théologiques chez Grégoire de Nazianze," *Revue D'études augustiniennes et patristiques* 53 (2007): 326 especially.

[48] Tabbernee offers some interesting possibilities for other influences, including noting echoes of Eusebius of Caesarea Maritima. William Tabbernee, "Gregory of Nazianzus, Montanism, and the Holy Spirit," in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (ed. Christopher Beeley; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press), 87–89. Leahy likewise demonstrates depth of Irenaeus' pneumatology. Brendan Leahy, "'Hiding behind the Works': The Holy Spirit in the Trinitarian Rhythm of Human Fulfillment in the Theology of Irenaeus," in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church: The Proceedings of the Seventh International Patristic Conference* (ed. Denis Vincent Twomey et al; Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2010), 11–31. Similarly on Irenaeus, Jeffrey Finch, "Irenaeus on the Christological Basis of Human Divinization," in *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology* (ed. Stephen Finlan and Vladimir Kharlamov; Eugene: Pickwick, 2006), 86–103. On Gregory Thaumaturgus see Claudio Moreschini, *I padri cappadoci: storia, letteratura, teologia* (Rome: Città Nuova, 2008), 7–14.

[49] Gregory Thaumaturgus will be discussed later, but on Eunomius' significance to especially the situation at Constantinople see Richard Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 320–21. For a brief summary of the soteriological dimensions of the Spirit in Origen see Henning Ziebritzki. *Heilger Geist und Weltseele: Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 203–5.

[50] On soteriological trajectories in the fourth century see Donald Fairbairn, "Patristic Soteriology: Three Trajectories," *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society* 50, no. 2 (2007): 289–310.

[51] The argument has been made by others that, given his time in Caesarea Maritima, a young Gregory would have been exposed to the post-325 struggles of Athanasius and Marcellus, and potentially to the person of Didymus the Blind. Norris also speculated that, on the basis of some comments made in the *Theological Orations*, that Gregory had knowledge of at least some of Cyril of Jerusalem's catechetical orations during his stay in Palestine. While this may be taken as evidence in favour of the selection, it is not the motivation behind it. See in particular Norris, *Faith Gives Fullness*, 2–3.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

1. Marcellus of Ancyra

The first example to be examined of a fourth-century pneumatology with soteriological implications is that of Marcellus of Ancyra and the fragments of his *Ast.* This work is dated around 335 when it was presented to Constantine, before Marcellus' deposition and exile in 336 for Sabellianism.[52] Little is known of Marcellus' early life except that he was born around 285 and that he was a participant in the Council of Nicaea. It is the period after this which is of concern here: the reception of his work, the increasing influence of the Homoians, and his own absence from the dedication of the Holy Sepulchre collided to result in his exile in 336.[53] While Marcellus continued to write after his exile and later restoration to his see of Ancyra, it is the early date of *Ast*. which causes it to be of interest. Although the thorough working-out of the Spirit did not begin in earnest until later in the fourth century, *Ast*. provides an insight into a moment long prior, the theological content of which has only been intermittently engaged.[54] In *Ast*., Marcellus seeks to affirm above all else the unity of the Godhead.[55] This fundamental investment that God is a monad is normative for all of Marcellus' claims in *Ast*. It is as a consequence of investment in the monad that he must argue the divinity of the Spirit and of its role in salvation. In this exploration, three things will be examined: the terms with which he expresses his argument; the account of divine action he creates with these terms; and his interpretation of biblical texts in support of this account.

The theological content of ὑπόστασις and οὐσία provided the problematic background, though not the basis for, Marcellus' arguments. Lienhard writes that they were "not words that Marcellus used naturally in his theolo-

[52] Sara Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy 325–345* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 100. See also Manlio Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* (Rome: Institutum patristicum Augustinianum, 1975), 132; Hanson, *Search*, 217; Joseph Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University Press of America, 1999), 4; Timothy Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), 240–42. The question of exactly when the deposition occurred is in question, but despite Socrates' statement in *HE* 2.42, 335–336 is far more probable than 330.

[53] Lienhard offers an extensive account of Marcellus' biography and the theological consequences therein in Lienhard, *Marcellus*, 1. For a valuable insight into questions of dating, exegesis, and Marcellus' thought generally see Joseph T. Lienhard, "The Exegesis of 1 Cor 15:24–28 From Marcellus of Ancyra to Theodoret of Cyrus," *VC* 37 (1983): 342 in particular.

[54] Michel René Barnes, "The Fourth Century as Trinitarian Canon," in *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric and Community* (ed. Lewis Ayres et al; London: Routledge, 1998), 53.

[55] Ayres' turn of phrase sums it up best: Marcellus sought to preserve unity in the Godhead "in ways that may have made even Athanasius blanch." Ayres, *Nicaea*, 62.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

gy." The majority of theological usage for both occurs in quotations.[56] While Marcellus is insistent on their singularity, his theology is articulated in terms of δύναμις (power) and ἐνέργεια (activity). Power, in Marcellus' thought as preserved in *Ast*., refers to power in the sense shared by his Eusebian opponents: it is the source of activity.[57] The Godhead is a single δύναμις, from which the Word and Spirit are experienced as distinct ἐνέργειᾳ μόνῃ.[58] As ἐνέργειᾳ μόνῃ, Marcellus also depends on Jn 15:26 and the "procession" of the Spirit from the Father.[59] The Spirit then receives its διακονία (mission) from the Son.[60] In this account, there is one source of action (which is to say one δύναμις) and the Spirit has a distinct existence as ἐνέργεια only. The appearance of distinction is only nominal: the members of the Trinity may be apprehended as distinct only by their actions in the economy – no ontological change takes place as a result.[61] The problems of this terminological edifice, its incapability of providing any account of divine individuation chief among them, are exacerbated when considering Marcellus' account of the 'how' and 'why' an ἐνέργεια acts in creation. Now that this basic rendering of Marcellus' terms has been established, it is possible to understand what he does with them.

If the terms with which Marcellus expressed himself are unexpected, the argument he then constructs is perhaps more foreseeable with even a limited knowledge of his circumstances. Although Marcellus' understanding of the Trinity firmly places the Spirit within the Godhead, due to the fragmentary nature of his works it is difficult to determine what the role of the Spirit in salvation history was for him. The contours of his soteriology found in *Fr*. 107, 110, 111, 117 are suggestive, however. Within them there is a strong emphasis on deification and upon the restoration of mankind through the incarnation.[62] With the incarnation, a second economy is created, an economy

[56] *Fr*. 81–83; 96; 97 for occurrences of οὐσία, and *Fr*. 63; 66; 69; 74 for occurrences of ὑπόστασις. See Lienhard, *Marcellus*, 53–62. It was *Ast*. itself which may be credited with shattering the strained consensus over ὁμοούσιος in the East. See G.L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, 222.

[57] Ayres suggests that the term may have been chosen by Marcellus in an attempt to undermine their "two-power" theology. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 64.

[58] *Fr*. 52; 61. Lienhard's translation of δύναμις and ἐνέργεια as power and active power respectively is shared by Ayres.

[59] *Fr*. 66; 67. Lienhard, *Marcellus*, 53. See also Hanson, *Search*, 229 for an account of Eusebius' misunderstanding of Marcellus' pneumatology.

[60] *Fr*. 67

[61] The apparent modalism of this model is addressed by Ayres: "Marcellus should not be interpreted within the context of modern psychologies in which the distinct experience of reason occurs only by way of logical abstraction. In some ancient psychologies one could speak of distinct faculties within a whole." Ayres, *Nicaea*, 63.

[62] Lienhard, *Marcellus*, 64.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

of the flesh.[63] Alongside this second economy, a further, third economy of the Spirit is begun. In no case is the prior economy annulled by the next: the eternality of the single δύναμις is not compromised by the appearance in ἐνέργειᾳ μόνῃ of successive economies in the order of salvation.[64] The Spirit is an inspirational and revelatory ἐνέργεια borne out in the Apostles and then the church after Christ is risen.[65] This extensive characterisation of the Spirit is largely absent from the fragmentary account presented in *Ast*., although the lengthy treatments in *Inc*. *Ar*., a work now believed to be by Marcellus or his disciples as late as 370, strongly links together the investiture of the Spirit in man with the incarnation.[66] When attention is given to the scriptural content of Marcellus' argument, the soteriological role of the Spirit, laid out in *Inc*. *Ar*., is seen to be active in this earlier work.

While Marcellus cites widely from biblical sources in *Ast*., his engagement with three passages mentioned in Fr. 66 and 68 are of interest to the role of the Spirit in salvation history: Jn 15:26, 16:13–14, and 20:22. A notable point, to be developed later, is that Gregory is often given credit for having developed the divinity of the Spirit from Jn 15:26. On a generous reading of Marcellus, this is not so. However, Marcellus' exegetical technique is bound up with both his own theological investments in a divine monad, though equally with the significance of meaning from multiple plain sense readings of scripture.[67] The first two of these passages describe the procession and commissioning of the Spirit as already seen in Marcellus' pneumatology: in Jn 15.26, the Spirit ἐκπορεύσθαι from the Father, and in Jn 16:13–14 the mission of the Spirit is received from the Son. In Jn 20:22, however, the Spirit is shown as being given directly by the Son – a point of which Marcellus makes much in Fr 68. If the idea of a concurrent economy of the Spirit is accepted in light of wider textual situation created by *Inc. et c. Ar*., however, it is clear from Marcellus' biblical allusions that the Spirit operates in a process of the salvation of believers begun after the resurrection.[68]

---

[63] *Fr*. 73.

[64] See Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition Vol I: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon* (trans. John Bowden; London: A.R. Mowbry & Co., 1975), 282 for a treatment of this topic in Marcellus' extended corpus. Lienhard's suggestion that a third economy is speculative is not supportable if *Inc. Ar.* was written by Marcellus. See Lienhard, *Marcellus*, 53.

[65] *Inc. Ar.*, 9. Grillmeier, *Christian Tradition*, 282.

[66] See Hanson, *Search*, 222 for a treatment of the pitfalls of ascribing *Inc*. *Ar*. to a particular author. However, in moving towards what a Marcellan soteriological pneumatology might look like, it is still a valuable resource, even if it may be attributed to his students.

[67] For more on fourth-century exegesis see Ayres, *Nicaea*, 32–33. On the immediate controversies in which Marcellus' arguments and language arose see Rowan Williams, "The Logic of Arianism," *Journal of Theological Studies* 34 (1983): 56ff.

[68] Lienhard rejects both a distinct mission for the Spirit and a third economy. Lienhard, *Marcellus*, 53.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Marcellus' account presents a number of problems, even to such a generous analysis. Accepting that the more developed theology of *Inc. et c. Ar.* is representative of *Ast.*, Marcellus' concurrent economies do not provide a strong account of Trinitarian individuation inside or outside the economy. Though he had to assign some soteriological role to the Spirit, it was of more concern to Marcellus to demonstrate the perfection of a Spirit which proceeded from the Father, and in so doing contribute to an argument for divine unity. What comes across most strongly in this is that, although Marcellus has to provide such a reckoning of the divinity and action of the Spirit, the account he offers (explored above) is inadequate. In this light, it is telling that Marcellus' account of economy is in no small part conditioned by how his stance on the Spirit is understood. He did away with a single economy of salvation in which all three persons of the Trinity are uniquely active. The economies Marcellus presented are the only indicators of unique action. Having cast off a unique mission for the Spirit, there can be no third economy. Eusebius, commenting on Marcellus' argument, felt that he had not distinguished the Spirit from the Son.[69] This is suggestive of the difficulty faced by Marcellus and those who would come after him: the account of salvation that they provide must do justice to (at least their conception of) the internal life of the Godhead. That account of salvation, as seen so clearly in Marcellus' consideration, is dictated by that internal life, however. While Marcellus is the first in the fourth century to attempt to incorporate the place of a divine Spirit, his theological commitment to the monad obscures some of the commendable characteristics of his account.

Having examined Marcellus' terms, account, and the exegesis that supports it, some conclusions may be drawn from this necessarily brief reappraisal of Marcellus' *Ast.* When considered with respect to later works, there is a soteriological role for the Spirit in Marcellus' *Ast.* He sought to define and defend the conception of the Godhead as a monad and undertook to use the divinity of the Spirit as one of the proofs of this. Those terms with which he most clearly expresses himself, δύναμις and ἐνέργεια, and many of the biblical texts to which he alluded, are products of his opponents' and his own very focused theological investments. The result, a fully divine Spirit, sent by the Father, who participates in the deification of believers after the resurrection is a formula that belies its early date of 335. Despite this, it is an extremely rudimentary account; and, given the account just explored, it might be suspected Marcellus did not really want to offer a fuller one. His exegesis and individual investments required that he do so, and its presentation is incidental to his larger point. It is, however, present at a time that pre-dates the most commonly recognised works on the Spirit. In the same way, it points forward towards Gregory's own efforts. The reliance on Jn 15:26 to provide a

[69] See *Ecclesiastical Theology*, 3.5.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

scriptural basis for the divinity of the Spirit, so often attributed to Gregory himself, found its first expression in Marcellus. In a more tenuous fashion, the Spirit receiving its "mission" from the Son parallels Gregory's own desire to see the Spirit as an agent of salvation. While it is unlikely that Gregory ever interacted with Marcellus, the latter's works highlight that Gregory was not as novel in his aims as sometimes contended.

2. Cyril of Jerusalem

The next subject, Cyril of Jerusalem, could hardly be more different than Marcellus. His aims differed radically: whereas Marcellus was concerned with the unity of the Godhead, Cyril – in his utterly different milieu – was keen to ward off any suggestion of Sabellianism in his account of divine unity. Bishop of Jerusalem from 348 until his death in 386/7, Cyril was a figure who stood outside traditional categories of the period.[70] While his tenure as bishop was fraught – he was deposed, restored, exiled and again restored onwards from 357 – he was traditionally read as a Homoiousian. His contemporaries presented many views of his allegiances; but rather than dwell on an attempt to categorise him, it is best to regard him as a figure with strong investments in traditional emphases of distinction as evinced by the Eusebians, who still sought a clearer, more coherent account that went unmet until late in Cyril's career.[71] His *Cat*. were delivered to newly baptised Christians some time around 351, making them didactic in character – in contrast with the apologetic seen in *Ast*.[72] This precludes simple comparisons between the two works. Cyril and Marcellus were aiming at different targets with their respective works. These differences in method, and their attendant individual innovations, comprise the most appropriate locus for comparison. The most basic underlying theological investment of their pneumatology, namely to assert the inclusion of the Spirit in the Godhead and affirm its role in salvation, are the same. This concern for the divinity of the Spirit evinced in *Cat*. 16 and 17 – which best preserve Cyril's soteriological pneumatology – and the substantial role in salvation assigned to the Spirit both within and beyond baptism are striking, and remain indispensable for charting the soteriological

[70] Ayres, *Nicaea*, 153.

[71] Ayres emphasizes Cyril's ability to test even flexible categories and offers a concise summation of Cyril's career in support of this. See Ayres, *Nicaea*, 154. For a more traditional account of Cyril see Hanson, *Search*, 398–413; Anthony A. Stephenson, "St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Trinitarian Theology," in StPatr 11 (1972), 234–41; Robert C. Gregg, "Cyril of Jerusalem and the Arians," in *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments* (Reprint) (ed. Robert C. Gregg; Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2006), 85–109.

[72] For more on the dating of the *Cat*. see Alexis Doval, "The Date of Cyril of Jerusalem's Catecheses," *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1997): 129–32.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

pneumatology of the period.[73] In exploring this account, there are two points to consider: first, the scripture-focused, style of *Cat*. 16 and 17; second, how, in presenting this self-limited, didactic account, Cyril still makes striking points about the activity of the Spirit.

The distinctive character of Cyril's work is apparent from the style with which he did (or did not) express his argument. It is this that serves as the entry point into this unusual figure: his methodological use of self-interpreting scriptural references must be grasped. Whereas Marcellus' theological framework hinged on the use of the terms δύναμις and ἐνέργεια to support his demonstration of the singularity of ὑπόστασις and οὐσία in the Godhead, Cyril insisted that inquiry into nature was meddlesome.[74] If the nature of the Spirit was written in the Scriptures, the newly baptised to whom Cyril spoke would already know it. There was no need to venture such questions otherwise. His lack of engagement with these terms, whose currency among various theological factions variously freighted this language with meaning, did not prevent Cyril from speculating on questions with which those terms were often associated; rather, it merely demonstrates Cyril's studious abstention from language of whose utility and meaning he may have been uncertain.[75]

Cyril's lack of engagement with the theological grammar of the period is supplemented by his emphasis on scriptural quotations. Long sections of the *Cat*. 16 and 17 are composed entirely of citations from wide-ranging scriptural sources. The titular genre of the *Cat*. assumes the didactic role of scripture with supposedly self-explanatory passages, but for Cyril they serve a further function. Through the citation of scriptural verses, which often appear somewhat disparate, he creates frameworks for interpretation that rely upon the

[73] Hanson notes Cyril as one of a pair of "interesting exceptions." Hanson, *Search*, 743. Kharlamov also notes that while Cyril refers to the deifying action of the Spirit, it goes entirely unexplained. Vladimir Kharlamov, "Rhetorical Application of Theosis in Greek Patristic Theology," in *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions* (ed. Michael Christensen et al; Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007), 115.

[74] *Cat*. 16.24.

[75] This is one point in Day's otherwise excellent analysis of Cyril's pneumatology that is potentially problematic. She writes, "The closest Cyril gets to discussing the nature and substance of the Spirit is when refusing the notion that he is a creature or that he is an emanation." Day astutely observes that open theological engagement with this language is not part of Cyril's agenda. He certainly does engage with the questions of individuation (he affirms that the Spirit is in itself, and is not many spirits in scripture) and status (the Spirit is equally honoured) which those terms were intended to address. This may be Day's meaning, in any case. See Juliette Day, "Cyril of Jerusalem on the Holy Spirit," in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church* (ed. Denis Vincent Twomey et al; Portland: Four Courts Press, 2010), 83.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

reception of each successive passage.[76] There is little cross-over between Cyril's scriptural citations and those of Marcellus, though it is possible to speculate that this is attributable to Eusebius' selective quotations of Marcellus' work. There is, however, a noteworthy parallel in their use of Jn 16:13–14, which they cite to similar purpose.[77] While Marcellus and Cyril both use these verses to demonstrate identity, Cyril moves from affirming a single faith and salvation to insisting, as noted above, that there be no further inquiry into the nature of the Godhead. While there is not the space for an extended treatment of the numerous proof texts shared by the theologians in this study, this example neatly demonstrates the capacity for shared investments and texts, accompanied by similar but utterly divergent readings.

Turning to the second point of consideration regarding this account, what Cyril wished to say of the Spirit often seems obscured as a result of his method. Cyril did not wish to venture much beyond the written text, but he did wish the believer to find a certain meaning in those writings. While there is not space in this study to delve into all the nuances of his exegesis, awareness of certain elements must inform any reading going forward. In *Cat*. 16.3–4, Cyril affirms the unity of the Spirit in itself. By this he meant that there is only one Spirit spoken of in the scriptures, despite its many operations. This Spirit sanctifies, enlightens and inspires. *Cat.*16.5 precedes a later declamation against numerous heresies concerning the Spirit, and in *Cat*. 16.5 Cyril reiterates the impossibility of articulating the ὑπόστασις of the Spirit. So, he speaks apophatically: he denies a range of heresies before turning to his citation of scriptural verse, constructing a more positive portrait which affirms the traits suggested in *Cat.* 16.2.

The Spirit Cyril offers is intimately bound up in the occasion on which he speaks of it. Beginning from the unity of the Godhead, he presents a Spirit whose operation in those present begins in baptism, but who seals, inspires and purifies throughout their lives and throughout the whole of the church.[78] This is a Spirit that acts in salvation in some way, and with its own identity distinguished from that of the Father and Son. In asserting this distinction, Cyril at once demonstrated his concern for the divinity of the Spirit and for its role in salvation. In *Cats*. 16.3, 17.2, 17.5, 17.29, and 17.33, the Spirit speaks on its own; Cyril wishes to emphasise that the Spirit is not itself spoken and that it undertakes its various operations in itself. It undertakes a multiplicity of operations, but it is not a multiplicity of spirits: it is a single subsistence worthy of honour equal to the Father and Son, as evinced by its op-

[76] Day highlights this genre-coded replacement of discursive argument with mutually self-interpreting sequences of quotation. Day, "Cyril of Jerusalem," 78.

[77] *Cat*. 16.24.

[78] *Cat*. 16.22.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

erations in the economy of salvation.[79] Despite his underlying investment in the unity of the Godhead, Cyril exceeded the image presented by Marcellus quite obviously in this regard. Cyril is at pains to demonstrate the distinct, personal role of the Spirit in the lives of his audience while also maintaining the mysterious unity of the Godhead. However, Cyril's account was thin on the detail of what might be identified as a crucial role for the Spirit.[80] These passages affirming the individuality of the Spirit, and its role as sanctifier and not sanctified – a point which will be of great consequence in later accounts, and in Gregory's thought – are few in number. Whether as a result of genre or intent it is a broad, but not a deep, treatment of the economic action of the Spirit.

This consideration of Cyril has been brief by necessity, but it has covered his overall method and his treatment of the Spirit in the two relevant texts, *Cat*. 16 and 17. Cyril's work also yielded another surprising early account of a divine Spirit engaged in the work of salvation. In two lectures steeped in the traditions of their genre, Cyril offered an image of a Spirit that seals, inspires and sanctifies believers in and beyond baptism. This was a Spirit which was to be glorified alongside Father and Son and which – crucially for this project – speaks. This working-out occurred with little reference to the theological grammar of the time, from a theologian who defies even the most generously-defined categories. Restricting the terms of his argument to those which could, in his view, be shown in scripture, his is a more forceful account than seen in Marcellus even if only because it achieves a similar end – the implied divinity of the Spirit – without recourse to the monad. Cyril was concerned to show that the Spirit can stand on its own. He offers a fuller, albeit still rather wan, account of divine individuation for the Spirit in salvation. Although Cyril and Marcellus set their sights on considerably different targets, in their attempts to describe a divine Spirit at work in salvation they should surprise: though often overlooked, in many ways they resemble the more developed accounts which came after them. Many of the parallels with Gregory's writings are superficialities dependent on widely shared terms. However, despite the caution of his account, Cyril was concerned to emphasise that these terms

[79] Ayres suggests that Cyril may be hinting at the Spirit as "undiminished giver." Further note the absence of such a doctrine from Marcellus' account except by implication, with the identification of Spirit with a divine monad. See Lewis Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as 'Undiminished Giver': Didymus the Blind's *De Spiritu Sancto* and the development of Nicene pneumatology," in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church* (ed. Denis Vincent Twomey et al; Portland: Four Courts Press, 2010), 65.

[80] Day writes of apparent exclusion that, "at key points where some nuanced distinctions between the Persons might have been made, Cyril studiously avoids them." It is precisely a lack of nuanced distinctions, coupled with Cyril's assumption that his audience would follow the implications of his sequences of scriptural references, which weakens his account. See Day, "Cyril of Jerusalem," 83.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

of the Spirit's operation were at least appropriate to it and not the manifestation of an activity, or of a monad.

3. Athanasius of Alexandria

Having explored two often-overlooked early accounts, attention can now be given to a more widely studied treatise: Athanasius' *Ep. Serap*. This work consists of three letters from Athanasius to Serapion, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, written in 359 to 360.[81] Although these letters preserve the most developed articulation of his soteriological pneumatology, the nature of Athanasius' investments require retrospection, and consideration of other works – particularly the double apology of *Inc.–Gent*. and the later *Or. c. Ar*. Written against the pneumatology of the τροπικοὶ, so-called by Athanasius because their metaphorical exegesis reduced (in his eyes) the Spirit to a ministering angel, these letters represent the fullest presentation of Athanasius' pneumatology and his attempts to articulate its soteriological content.[82] In them, he demonstrated the full integration of a divine Spirit into his theology – a process which saw its beginning in *Or. c. Ar*., but the roots of which debate may be found as far back as Marcellus' *Ast*.[83]

Marcellus' and Cyril's soteriological pneumatologies were related to their larger investments, but their presentation was utterly indivisible in the former, and almost entirely separate in the latter. Demonstrating the comparative simplicity of those accounts, Athanasius presented a fully integrated doctrine of salvation with one of the Spirit. This intersection occurs as an outworking of an already established and integrated position on the intersection of Christology and soteriology – to the extent that these latter two are blurred. While such blurring is necessarily a characteristic of any account as technically proficient as Athanasius', it presents a problem for an abbreviated study of this nature. A failure to grapple with the soteriology upon which his pneumatology rested leads, at worst, to a caricature. Attempting to provide an account of it, however, strains the limits of what can be communicated here. This being the case, attention will be given to the part of Athanasius' account that is weighted towards the Spirit, while making clear those areas that came about prior to *Ep. Serap*. Undertaking this exploration, there are three key areas to consider. First, Athanasius' method, in particular the theological grammar and the nature of his higher-level investments. Second, how these

[81] Claudio Moreschini et al, *Early Greek and Christian Literature: A Literary History*, vol. 2 (trans. Matthew. J. O'Connell; Peabody: Hendrickson, Inc., 2005), 41. For a valuable comment on this see K. Anatolios, *Athanasius: The Coherence of His Thought* (London: Routledge, 1998), 90.

[82] Timothy Barnes, *Athansius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 133.

[83] Anatolios, *Athanasius*, 114.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

investments are expressed in the soteriological formulations which he presents in *Ep. Serap*., and how this is reflective of his earlier work. Third, having grasped how this earlier investment manifested in *Ep. Serap*., how Athanasius' pneumatology was integrated with it.

This examination will therefore begin by considering Athanasius' theological grammar, and the investments that necessitate the interfacing of doctrines. What is most striking about Athanasius' soteriological pneumatology is this melding of ostensibly distinct doctrines. Like Marcellus and Cyril, he is concerned to show the divinity of the Spirit. Unlike Marcellus, he was at pains to do so in a way that preserved his ability to provide an account of divine individuation, though in the ebb and flow of argument this is less apparent than it is elsewhere. Unlike Cyril, Athanasius presented this argument with the same grammar he used for the Father and the Son; indeed, the nature of his argument is such that it demands it.[84] This is borne out in Athanasius' terminologies. By the time of *Ep. Serap*. he confidently asserted the Spirit as ὁμοούσιος with the Son, and by extension with the Father.[85] Father and Son, and Son and Spirit share the same kind of unity.[86] This arises from a sentiment more similar to that of Marcellus than Cyril. For Athanasius' larger doctrine of God, the Spirit cannot have been created, as this would introduce a mediating element either internal to the Trinity or external to it, between God and creation, other than the incarnate Christ.[87] This focus on identity in the immanent Godhead yielded the somewhat perfunctory account of individual action in the economy found in Marcellus' writings. Athanasius, however, pressed on to propose economic action that is unique to the Spirit. Perhaps counter-intuitively, he argued for the close association of the Spirit with the Son.[88] Thus while the Spirit is like the Father and the Son in qualities – sanctifies, and is not sanctified (1.22); seals, and is not sealed (1.23); is immutable (1.26); is participated in and is unique in essence proper to the Father and the Son (1.27) – there are activities which are uniquely extended through the

[84] See Day, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, 83 for more on the distinction in the "vocabularies" Cyril uses for the Father, Son, and Spirit.

[85] *Ep. Serap*. 1.27, 26. As Prestige puts it, "[The Spirit] is impropriate to the Logos who is one, and impropriate to God who is one, and is *homoousios* with Him." See Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London: William Heinemann, 1936), 218. It is worth noting that Athanasius, in *Ep. Serap*., did not refer to the Spirit as God, perhaps because like Cyril he wished to avoid the implication of Sabellianism. It should be further noted that Athanasius' understanding of ὁμοούσιος was at times not strictly adherent to distinctions between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις.

[86] *Ep. Serap.* 1.2.

[87] Hanson concisely articulates Athanasius' theological motive in these terms. However, he puts weight on Athanasius having been the first to have "faced squarely" the issue of the Spirit. Even if Marcellus and Cyril's accounts are sufficiently problematic so as to not qualify, Origen surely does. See Hanson, *Search*, 748–49.

[88] *Ep. Serap*. 1.31.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Spirit that Athanasius identified in manner with the Son.[89] While Cyril was content to affirm that the likeness in honour of the Spirit implies its divinity, and assigned to it a role in salvation, his design was constrained by the independent vocabulary he used of the Spirit. Marcellus, in having to strongly set out unity with his unique vocabulary, rode over the individuation of the members of the Trinity entirely. To grasp the degree to which Athanasius' account exceeded these others, attention must be paid to the action of salvation in which the Spirit participates, as he conceived it – that is to say, Athanasius' soteriology.

In approaching the second point of exploration, that of Athanasius' soteriological formations, a singular feature stands out as demanding attention: Athanasius' soteriology begins from the incarnation. The immutable and transcendent Word, having taken on a body, is sacrificed in death – the consequence of man's sin. Sin is atoned for through this sufficient sacrifice, which confers the qualities of the Word to the body.[90] Through this redemption of the body, the source of sin is nullified. Salvation not only becomes possible through the incarnation (not a contentious argument), but the assumption of body becomes of definitive importance – Christology and soteriology run together. Hanson questions Athanasius' investment in the Atonement, though Anatolios' account offers a sound corrective. Hanson is quite right in arguing, "Athanasius pushes this act [redemption] back into the Incarnation..."[91] When the first elements of this doctrine were presented in *Inc.–Gent*., the Spirit does not figure into this soteriological account. However, in *Or. c. Ar.*, where Athanasius affirmed the divinity of the Spirit, human receptivity of the Spirit is likewise bound up in the incarnation. Just as the assumption of human flesh by Christ makes possible the salvation of humanity, his reception of the Spirit while incarnate makes possible the believer's reception of the Spirit. Thus, like his soteriology, his pneumatology begins from the incarnation.

From this arises the third point of exploration: how this account, as presented in *Ep. Serap*., integrated these investments into a soteriological pneumatology. By making it possible for mankind to be suffused with the Spirit, the grace of the Spirit is secured, which in turn enacts the possibility of salvation evinced in the incarnation. In *Ep. Serap*. 3.4, Athanasius highlighted this in his argument that the Spirit has the Son, and the Son the Spirit. This is placed in the immediate context of assertions of the individuation of the Spirit from the Son: essential operations of the salvation made possible through the incarnate Christ are thus joined to the Spirit and likewise secured, but the

[89] *Ep. Serap*. 1.30.
[90] *Inc*. 9–10. See Anatolios, *Athanasius*, 75–76.
[91] See Hanson, *Search*, 450.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Spirit maintains a separate identity.[92] While Athanasius affirms the reality of independent action by the Spirit in sanctifying, anointing, and divinising (1.24–25, 2.4), these actions in salvation are appropriate to the Spirit but not distinct. Although the elevation of the believer is achieved through the Spirit, it is achieved through the Spirit in the Son.[93] Athanasius did not stumble into the same morass as Marcellus. On the contrary, Athanasius' investments did not permit him to say that the Son descended upon himself. However, he encountered Cyril's problem from the other direction. He was unable to offer firm declarations of the specific action of the Spirit in salvation: his incarnational Christology swallowed up his soteriology, and the soteriological significance of the Spirit necessarily reflects this.[94]

Having examined Athanasius' method – his grammar and investments – and the material of his account – both his soteriology and pneumatology, in *Ep. Serap*. and elsewhere – it is possible to make some closing remarks on the comparison of this account with its predecessors. In a different letter to a different bishop, Athanasius might have further expounded on the specific action of the Spirit in salvation and built out his comments on its divinising activity. It is an account that he himself said in *Ep. Serap*. 4.23 was merely a starting point. His aims in writing *Ep. Serap*. necessarily placed his focus on demonstrating the divinity of the Spirit – figuring it into his larger soteriological framework is a matter of necessity dictated by that divinity. It is undertaken with aplomb, but by dint of his premise he necessarily minimised the Spirit in favour of the Son. Regardless, Athanasius is the first fourth-century theologian to affirm the divinity of the Spirit in a grammar shared by the Father and the Son, without resigning them to a monad.[95] He offered a grand account, only the most specific portion of which has been examined in detail here.[96] From this exploration, however, it is possible to assert this much: Athanasius was not the first to deal seriously with the place of the Spirit in the immanent Godhead and the economy of salvation, but at the time of his drafting the letters, his was the most capable account. Although moving

[92] Anatolios convincingly argues the role of the Spirit in "securing" grace in Athanasius' thought, though this does not further establish distinct operations. See Anatolios, *Athanasius*, 158–59.

[93] *Ep. Serap*. 1.30.

[94] Hanson notes this blending of soteriology and Christology in Athanasius' account. See Hanson, *Search*, 751–52.

[95] On the distinctions between Athanasian and Cappadocian modes of Trinitarian argument, see Barnes, "Trinitarian Canon," 60–61. Although he is not concerned with soteriological pneumatology, Barnes' observations are conceptually useful.

[96] Finch's comments on the deifying role of the Son highlight an especially interesting point of comparison that falls outside the remit of the present consideration. Jeffrey Finch, "Athanasius on the Deifying Work of the Redeemer," in *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*, vol. 1 (ed. Stephen Finlan; Eugene: Pickwick, 2006) 120.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

chronologically through these texts give evidence of development only in very minute, terminological ways, it is evident that each theologian sought to meet the same challenge – if the Spirit is part of the internal life of the Godhead, how is this manifest in the economy of salvation? – on their own terms, in their own context.

Suggesting the conceptual superiority of one account over another is not a result of direct comparison but the relative success of each account in doing justice to the internal life of the Godhead as revealed in scripture. By these lights, then, though Athanasius' account may be regarded as distinctive and superior to those of Marcellus and Cyril, it is still limited by Athanasius' emphasis on an incarnational Christology into which a soteriological pneumatology had to be fitted. It presents a Spirit whose action in the economy is dependent on the Son in a way which somewhat exceeds Marcellus' idea of the Son endowing the Spirit with its soteriological mission, although this belies the underlying assumption on Marcellus' part of a monadic unity. This problem of dependency is one which Gregory would confront directly, and to which his underlying theological commitments, as discussed in the previous section, would allow a more thorough response. Didymus, rather than Athanasius, bears the strongest similarity to Gregory's account.

4. Didymus and a Contemporary Spirit

Regarded as a dogmatic work, Didymus' *De Spiritu Sancto* survives only in a Latin translation from Jerome, made in 384. Ambrose used it in 381, and it is clear that it must have been composed after 360, as it makes explicit reference to the Macedonians.[97] This makes the text contemporary with much of Gregory's own early work, and similarities will quickly become apparent. Didymus was himself a student of Athanasius and the leader of the Alexandrian school upon the latter's death in 373. Though *De Trinitate* must have been composed before 381, its dubious attestation to Didymus makes it a problematic subject for a brief survey such as this.[98] While *Spir.*'s present form offers its own problems when addressing questions of authenticity, it remains an invaluable source of insight into a soteriological pneumatology contemporary with much of Gregory's own thought.[99] In exploring Didymus'

[97] Moreschini and Noreli, *Literature*, 75.

[98] It is certainly worth highlighting that, if it is authentic to Didymus, the emphasis on the deifying action of the Spirit identified by Gross offers further parallels with Gregory. See Jules Gross, *The Divinization of the Christian According to the Greek Fathers* (trans. Paul A. Onica; Anaheim: A&C Press, 2002), 198.

[99] See Lewis Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as 'Undiminished Giver': Didymus the Blind's De Spiritu Sancto and the Development of Nicene Pneumatology," in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church* (ed. Denis Vincent Twomey et al; Portland: Four Courts Press, 2010), 59 and *Spir*. 55 for Jerome's notes on his translation.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

account, it is necessary to grapple with his use of participation (μετοχή or *participatio*) as a hermeneutic. Didymus' use of participation language is not particularly remarkable, except in so far as it creates an important contrary. Gregory does not adopt this language of participation as a hermeneutic, despite it having its source in Origen.[100] This absence is especially notable in that Didymus and Gregory are roughly contemporary, had access to many of the same sources, and shared an investment in the divinity of the Spirit.[101] Bayliss goes so far as to argue that the "key concept" of Didymus' thought is the distinction between beings those which participate and those participated in.[102] There is a clear difference in the use of this language between Didymus and Gregory, despite their chronological (and potentially physical) proximity.

While superficially similar to that presented by Athanasius, what Didymus presents in *Spir*. is somewhat different from Athanasius' earlier account.[103] It reads as a more thoughtful than *Ep. Serap*. As a result, though it does encounter and respond to the Macedonians, Didymus is more content to consider questions rather than to present counter-arguments or proofs.[104] The arguments that Didymus presented for the divinity of the Spirit are, however, quite similar to what was found in Athanasius, and to a lesser extent in Cyril. The Spirit bestows wisdom in *Spir*. 10, and sanctifies in *Spir*. 13; the Spirit does not participate in either wisdom or sanctification. By bestowing and not participating in sanctification, and indeed being incapable of participating in sanctification itself, the Spirit is known to be immutable as posited in *Spir*. 16 and 19. That which is immutable belongs to the same substance as God, and thus the Spirit is divine. Didymus' reasoning to this end relied on the inter-

[100] Participation language rare in Gregory, including in the poetry that McGuckin has noted has the most "overt reliance on Origen's theology. See John McGuckin, "Gregory: The Rhetorician as Poet," in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (ed. Jostein Børtnes et al; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006), 201, n. 25. Maslov notes an exception in *Or*. 2. See Boris Maslov, "The Limits of Platonism: Gregory of Nazianzus and the Invention of *theōsis*," Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies (2012): 442. A notable exception is in *Or*. 33 when he writes of how one can participate [μετέχει] in the Spirit. *Or*. 33.17. SC 318, 194. While it is thus not wrong to speak of participation in the Spirit in Gregory's thought, it is not the technical use found in Didymus.

[101] On Didymus' adaptation of participation language from Origen see especially Kellen Plaxco, "Participation and Trinity in Origen and Didymus the Blind," in *Origeniana Undecima: Origen and Origenism in the History of Western Thought* (ed. Anders-Christian Jacobsen; Leuven: Peeters Press, 2016), 767–82.

[102] Grant Bayliss, *The Vision of Didymus the Blind: A Fourth-Century Virtue Origenism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 24.

[103] In his brief entry on Didymus, Swete writes that Didymus has succeeded "here and there" in making "new points." Despite his insight elsewhere, Swete overlooks Didymus' significant contributions. See Swete, *Ancient Church*, 222.

[104] Hanson describes it as, "not a full-blooded polemical work, but rather a considered treatise." Hanson, *Search*, 755.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

pretation of proof texts familiar from Cyril and Athanasius: Eph 1:13–14; 4:30; 1 Cor 1:24; Jn 17:11, and Mt 28:20. This language of participation (of in-dwelling) in the Spirit stands out. The participation of believers in the Spirit has sufficient weight for Didymus that he interprets Luke-Acts texts that had not before been considered in this way. Lewis Ayres highlights this point: "Didymus interprets all references to the Spirit's work among Christians as equivalent to the Spirit's indwelling presence... a considerable number of texts are offered from Luke-Acts, few of which had any previous extensive use in Christian tradition."[105] Indeed, if this concept is overlooked, Didymus' argument is quite similar to that of Athanasius, bar Didymus' emphasis on the Father and the Son sending the Spirit together in *Spir*. 26 and 117. Swete and Hanson note this point of difference, with the former seeking to associate it with the *filioque* and the latter describing it as "an interesting and significant distinction" without saying more.[106] In adopting a hermeneutic of participation on behalf of the Spirit, Didymus not only opened new pathways of exegetical inquiry but allowed for a more robust account of the action of the Spirit in the economy. In addition to this, Didymus' account of action is notable for its parallels.

The Spirit's bestowal of wisdom and sanctification offers the most recognisable, but also most well-worn track of Didymus' argument: God is the font of both wisdom and sanctification, and by participating in the Spirit the Christian is brought to God. The extremities of this line of argument are apparent in Cyril, and even more so in Athanasius. Didymus exceeded these, going yet further in his representation of the role of the Spirit. He, as noted, was reading accounts of indwelling as accounts of the Spirit, and saw its distinctive work in teaching (143) and the consolation of the sorrowful (123). Particularly notable, and distinctive of Didymus' style, is 84–86, in which he uses Lk 12:11–12 and 21:14–15 to argue that the wisdom taught by the Son is the wisdom of the Holy Spirit, and that the teaching of the Spirit is that of the Lord. Again, in 121–124, Didymus affirms the role of Son as mediator, and of Spirit as consoler. He affirms these as distinctive actions, but immediately shows that the Spirit is also mediator with reference to Rom 8:26–27.[107] This latter proposition of alternative mediation is something that Athanasius was especially unwilling to do; mediation for him was only possible by way of Christ's humanity.[108]

It is rather ironic that Didymus, by allowing for an extension of co-activity to mediation, is able to offer an account of the distinct activity of the Spirit in the economy of salvation. This is a marked difference from his mentor Atha-

[105] See Ayres, *Didymus*, 59.
[106] See Swete, *Spirit*, 225; Hanson, *Search*, 755.
[107] *Spir*. 122.
[108] See Hanson, *Search*, 749.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

nasius. These examples, and indeed all such examples of action of the Spirit that Didymus provides, returns to the affirmation of the unity in both action and essence of the immanent Trinity. In the first example, the Spirit teaches the wisdom of the Son, while the Father is all wisdom. In the second, the Spirit offers consolation, and the Father is all consolation. The Father who is all consolation sends the consoling Spirit to abide with the disciples of the Son. These occur naturally as a result of Didymus' premise articulated above: the participation of Christians in salvation is their participation in the Spirit.

Ultimately, Didymus was happy to place the Spirit in a meditative role. It is in this way that the account he offers gives a more organic image of a divine Spirit (even if it is not always entirely convincing). Whereas Athanasius was deeply concerned that the Word be exclusively mediating with creation, Didymus quite readily argues that if the Spirit is truly divine, the Spirit is equally capable of mediation. However, his position on this should not be taken too far. It is clear that he does not wish to imply anything other than identity of action in the immanent Godhead, nor imply a lack of mutual action in the economy. As outlined in the previous section, Gregory's investments included a stronger identification of the Spirit with distinctive operations, though in a manner largely consistent with those which Didymus proposed. Such similarities should not be surprising, given that Didymus' works examined here would be broadly contemporary with Gregory's. This sort of parallel development does not diminish the contributions of either, but instead should serve to highlight those areas where Gregory did distinguish himself: in approaching the soteriological operation of the Spirit from the experience of the believer and seeking to refine the language so this might be better expressed.

II. Conclusion

While it is not possible to appreciate the full scope of these theologians' thought in the brief outlines above, it is apparent that there was a progressive movement throughout the fourth century towards the accretion of language around the action of the Spirit. While uneven, owing to the wide range of theological and social investments at play, there is a trend towards equalising the importance of the Spirit with Christ as part of a wider Trinitarian agenda. When this is considered against Gregory's simple definition, laid out in the introduction, some areas of contact are apparent. Throughout all these figures, the Spirit secures an essential role in the salvation of the believer in tandem with Christ, while maintaining a distinct identity. While the quality of this role and of the distinction varies wildly, with regard to Marcellus in particular, Gregory's premise does not seem too alien. This tempering of expectations regarding his novelty is sorely needed. The most recent full study of Gregory's pneumatology argues that the Theologian has been unfairly con-

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

sidered the product of a natural progression of fourth-century pneumatology, but this is not quite accurate.[109]

Recent studies of Gregory's larger theological programme, including those which Opperwall cites to the contrary, recognise Gregory's pneumatology as significant both within his own theology and as part of the development of Christian theology.[110] Although some broader studies of the period do treat Gregory, and his pneumatology in particular, as either of a similar character with his immediate contemporaries or otherwise less significant than it is, many other studies avoid this tendency in no small part by engaging with more focused Nazianzus scholarship.[111] On this basis, Gregory's genuine contributions can only be appreciated in light of his reliance on an existing tradition. Norris' tentative moves to locate Gregory's contact with at least Athanasius and Cyril's works, and the person of Didymus, to his time in Caesarea Maritima may not be strictly verifiable; but Gregory's immersion in a Christian thought world still deeply impacted by the Nicene settlement and its aftermath can be readily asserted. In the following chapters, the discussion should be understood not just by Gregory's own often deceptively simple definitions of the Spirit, but in terms of the number of positions which informed it. Opperwall writes of his own study, "The reader may notice that... the historical context of Gregory's writings is often treated as of secondary."[112] He is right to point out how well advanced scholarship surrounding the immediate context of Gregory's writings is, but a failure to treat with the historical development behind Gregory easily leads to an overstatement of the novelty of the premise of his pneumatology, rather than encouraging close analysis of its contents. An acknowledgement of Gregory's intellectual forebears on this particular theological trajectory of a soteriologically-motivated Spirit tempers both expectation and analysis.

[109] Opperwall, "Holy Spirit," 1–2.

[110] See in particular Beeley, *Knowledge*, 155., "it was Gregory who played a leading role in reestablishing the Spirit's key position in subsequent Christian theology." Also, McGuckin, *Gregory*, 305, "This [Orat. 31.10] was a new epoch in the history of Nicene theology."

[111] Opperwall rightly identifies this tendency in Hanson, *Search*, 782; Also, Anthony Meredith, "The Pneumatology of the Cappadocian Fathers and the Creed of Constantinople," in *Irish Theological Quarterly* 48 (1981): 46. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 284, n. 29 is an excellent example of this development. Although Ayres' interest in the Cappadocians is here focused on Basil and Gregory of Nyssa, he defers to Norris' assessment of *Or*. 31.10 as the "locus classicus" of Nazianzen's theology.

[112] Opperwall, "Holy Spirit," 7.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Chapter 2

Salvation and the Spirit Between Athens and Nazianzus

Chapter 2 considers the period between 362 and 371 to examine what language Gregory used in relation to his soteriological pneumatology in his earliest letters, encomiums, and orations. This period is dense with linguistic development, but is often considered bereft of theological ideas that can be readily placed in the categories of modern scholarship. However, not only is the linguistic development of the period indicative of the ongoing development of a discrete soteriological pneumatology, the logic of other more readily identifiable developments in this period is consistent with the earliest intimations of a soteriological pneumatology. In order to draw this out, and to address relevant scholarship from Winslow, Althaus, Russell, Maslov, and Elm, the chapter has been divided into two.[1] The first half sets out the relationship between the Spirit and metaphorical language in Gregory's thought, and asserts the role of Gregory's hermeneutics as the principal source of Gregory's thought on what constitutes metaphor. The nature of metaphor in the context of Gregory's thought is also addressed. The second half is focused on Gregory's introduction of θέωσις as a novel term, and the degree to which individual linguistic novelty suggests innovative thinking in itself. This interrogation of Gregory's technical language, and the current scholarship around it, is accompanied by an analysis of the language utilised in his funeral orations.

A. Early Metaphors for Salvation

I. Assessing Metaphor in Gregory

Gregory's use of salvation language is more complex than the common (though not universal) scholarly emphasis on his introduction of θέωσις

[1] Although he has much to say on the Spirit and salvation, Kärkkäinen only occasionally addresses Gregory. His extensive body of work on the subject is a valuable recovery none the less. See in particular Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, ed., *Holy Spirit and Salvation: The Sources of Christian Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 47; and *Spirit and Salvation: A Constructive Christian Theology for a Pluralistic World*, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2016), 30.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

would suggest. This chapter will examine Gregory's earliest articulations of salvation and demonstrate that Gregory produced a complex array of language that had at its base the action of the Spirit in the believer. These articulations eschew simple association with either his Christology or with an individual metaphor such as θέωσις. Thus, while accepting Winslow's assertion that Gregory possessed a "soteriologically oriented christology [...] centered upon his concept of [θέωσις]" in principle, it should also be highlighed that the category of salvation exists as distinct from θέωσις. Further, that understanding θέωσις as a functional rather than merely descriptive term requires moving past individual instantiations of language to appreciate the range of thought upon which Gregory was building his own theological grammar.[2]

The problem presented by the breadth of Gregory's language is an enduring one. For the past forty years, Winslow's *Dynamics of Salvation* has continued to influence how the role of the Spirit in Gregory's soteriology has been approached. Winslow's positioning of θέωσις as the principal metaphor of Gregory's soteriology has conditioned the responses even of his critics. Winslow argues that θέωσις "became the one 'shorthand' metaphor under which all the other possible metaphors could be subsumed."[3] McGuckin posited that Winslow "is surely right in this hermeneutical perspective" on the grounds that it could accommodate divine descent and human ascent, given the "interchangeability" of ascent, vision, and cognition in Gregory.[4] However, these are not the only metaphors of note in Gregory's thought, and the degree of abstraction of θέωσις necessary to include all possible soteriological metaphors, as Winslow argues, distances it from its use in Gregory's works. A somewhat different way of thinking about metaphor can provide a means of resolving this.

The account put forward by Lakoff and Johnson will be found useful in navigating the problem of metaphor in Gregory's soteriological thought.[5] That is to say, it is useful to adopt the conceptualisation that metaphors are expansions which seek to explain or illuminate elements of human experience. To this extent, metaphors may be said to be true in and of themselves, without compromising the integrity of their referent.[6] This is not to suggest that Lakoff and Johnson present an account of truth that is identical to that which Gregory might have offered. However, this view of metaphor does

[2] Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, 87. Winslow's tendency to elevate certain metaphors or symbols, to his detriment, is well highlighted by Hofer, "Winslow's insistence on the cross sounds like it is importing a later concern…" See Hofer, *Christ*, 182.

[3] Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, 198.

[4] John McGuckin, "The Vision of God in St. Gregory Nazianzen," in StPatr 32 (1998), 147.

[5] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 3ff.

[6] Lakoff et al, *Metaphors*, 153–54.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

allow greater justice to each individual instantiation of Gregory's language, while permitting them to be related to an underlying experience.[7] This model grants greater power to each metaphor, allowing that each in some way conditions perception, and behaviour as well.[8] While this example stands outside the scope of their study, Lakoff and Johnson's contention still holds true: later understandings of salvation came to rely on Gregory's first instantiation of θέωσις as definitive. On returning to the source of this language, a view so conditioned would naturally posit that Gregory's own use is as significant to him.[9] On the contrary, θέωσις was his metaphorical attempt to explicate the underlying experience of salvation and sat alongside a far wider range of language.[10] The reduction of θέωσις, and deification language more generally, to a mere "figure of speech" in itself demands as much.[11] Furthermore, given the continuum in which Gregory's language has been continually adopted and adapted to occupy positions of significance, and even been equated directly with salvation, it seems necessary to allow for such.[12] Ultimately, θέωσις is a single metaphor and, as will be explored in Section 2.2, is not the basis of Gregory's thought.

Thus, while it is appropriate to assert that θέωσις or θεοποίησις are metaphors for salvation, they are metaphors that appear rarely in Gregory's corpus and on this basis alone cannot be said to describe the entire content of his soteriology. Nor are they so encompassing as to obviate the need for Gregory's other metaphors. To undertake a linguistic shift away from speaking of salvation to speaking only of θέωσις is to emphasise the metaphor over the experience of salvation as described by Gregory. To this extent, while it may be appropriate to speak of deification as salvation, in that deification as a translation attempts to capture the broad sense of many metaphors, far greater caution must be taken with Gregory's language in its context.[13] In particular,

[7] The reader should be cautioned therefore that future references to metaphor refer to the understanding put forward by Lakoff and Johnson. Those uses in quotations refer to the understandings held by their authors.

[8] Lakoff et al, *Metaphors*, 156

[9] Ibid., 211.

[10] This is a stronger view of metaphor than that put forward by, for example, Soskice, for whom metaphors are, however significant, "figures of speech" which seek to address their subject in a "direct way" without "dissembling." See Janet Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 54–56.

[11] As so identified by Russell, *Deificiation*, 13.

[12] See Verna Harrison, "Θέωσις as Salvation: An Orthodox Perspective," *Pro Ecclesia* 6 (1997): 435.

[13] An excellent example of this is to be found in Christensen, who accuses those "who object to the ancient understanding of *theosis*" of trying to "solve the problem of *theosis* by simply omitting the term" or "objecting to passages about *theosis* in ancient texts." While this is a valid concern, any attempt to ascertain the "ancient" meaning of θέωσις is ill-served by using it to encompass a much wider body of language. Michael Christensen,

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Winslow's conclusions, in which he sets up θέωσις as a six-fold metaphor, are somewhat problematic.[14] The apparent need for sub-dividing a single building block of Gregory's language in itself highlights the inadequacy of a single metaphor.

Russell accepts Winslow's conclusions on a qualified basis, though this should not be taken as an endorsement of Winslow's overall position, especially in light of Russell's own narrow area of interest in deification as defined by a range of technical terms. On this ground, it can be stated that while Winslow is right about θέωσις, and that his conclusions are valid in so far as θέωσις is used in Nazianzus, it serves only to illuminate a single part of the experience of salvation. Furthermore, to isolate Gregory to a single metaphor on the basis of Lossky's work is to pass over the extensive development θέωσις underwent after Gregory coined it, and to overstate the significance of θέωσις to the point of making it a salvation category in itself – something which is not supportable on the basis of Gregory's early works. A consequence of this is a failure to distinguish between deification as an early metaphor for salvation, and deification as encompassing all of salvation. This articulation necessarily depends on reading the interpretation of later figures such as Maximus or Gregory of Palamas back into Gregory of Nazianzus. Lossky, in discussing deification ("or θέωσις"), references Seraphimn of Sarov, Gregory of Nyssa, John Cassian, Macarius of Scetis, the 19th-century Theophanes, Isaac the Syrian (of the three stages of deification), John Climacus, Maximus Confessor, Evagrius Ponticus, Gregory Palamas, Symeon the New Theologian, Nicephorus, Gregory of Sinai, Mark the Hermit, Diadochus of Photike, and Basil of Caesarea as positive authorities. He does not mention Gregory of Nazianzus.[15] Second, such restrictions limit the role of the Spirit. Winslow appears to have at once been aware of and fallen prey to this, writing that:

> Browne and Swallow (*NPNF*, 7, p. 228) have commented that, for Gregory, θέωσις is a "very strong expression to bring out the reality and intimacy of the Christian's union with Christ as the result of the sanctifying grace by which all the baptized [sic] are made "partakers of the Divine Nature." Yet, as we have seen, Gregory does not use this text to support his 'corporate' understanding of θέωσις; nor, of course, does he limit his concept of "deification" to that which is effected at baptism. [...] For a helpful discussion of θέωσις as "union," see V. Lossky, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church, Ch. 10.'[16]

"The Promise, Process, and Problem of *Theosis*," *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions* (ed. Michael Christensen et al; Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007), 29.

[14] Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, 193.

[15] See Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 196–216. While Russell also has an expansive view of deification, Lossky's use of θέωσις as a direct parallel makes the omission especially problematic. See Russell, *Deification*, 1–3.

[16] Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, 197, n. 1.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Browne and Swallow's example of a careful qualification of the utility of the θέωσις metaphor and its boundaries is overlooked in favour of introducing a broad category of deification to encompass all of Gregory's soteriology. Although Winslow rightly acknowledges the absence of 2 Pet 1:4 from Gregory's writings, which Lossky (and Browne and Swallow) do not, he, along with Lossky, still attempts to bring all of Gregory's soteriology together under the heading of deification. This requires that other salvation metaphors either be appropriated or devalued, concurrent with the elevation of θέωσις, and to a lesser extent θεοποίησις.[17] While the Spirit is broadly associated with deification in Gregory, the only concrete discussion of its activity in relation is located in baptism, itself a wellspring of deification language in general. However, in drawing all the other salvation metaphors under the heading of deification, narrowly defined by terms made technical long after Gregory's death, the Spirit's activity in baptism becomes overpoweringly central, obfuscating any other action that might be highlighted by alternate metaphors. As a consequence, the activity of the Spirit in salvation is curtailed.

Contrary to the position set out by Winslow that there is one metaphor in which all others are subsumed, and which is fit to be deconstructed to understand Gregory's soteriology, when attention is given to Gregory's early orations a range of salvation metaphors are found to be at play. While this breadth might be attributable to the immaturity of Gregory's thinking, such an argument poorly serves any defence of the importance of θέωσις, as it is also found these early orations. An explanation rests in recognising that Gregory's early orations are a witness of a new way of talking about an existing, complex conception of salvation rather than the creation of an entirely new type in itself. This chapter will establish that the disparate and sometimes conflicting applications of salvation language in these early orations, and how it corresponds to the experience of the Spirit's soteriological operation.

II. Language and the Individual

While not the richest seam of his pneumatological thought, any attempt to understand the linguistic association between salvation and the Spirit must begin with Gregory's earliest works. In his well known, if under-examined, letter to Basil Gregory wrote that he longed for, "The kinship and growing together of the brethren who were deified and exalted under you? The contest and incitement of virtue, which we safeguarded by rescripts and standards?

[17] The relationship between these two terms will be explored further in Section 2.2.1 in particular.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

The love of labour in the oracles of God, and the light we found in them with the guidance of the Holy Spirit[;]"[18] While apparently superficial references, these are the earliest mentions either of salvation or of so-called deification language in Nazianzus. They are also helpful in addressing criticisms that Gregory was unconcerned with salvation and the Spirit until later in his career.[19] This conclusion is dependent upon an extremely narrow reading of Gregory's early works. While he would not go on to develop his three central works on the Spirit, *Ors*. 31 and 41 and *Carm*. 1.1.4, until much later in his career, the language that underlay them was already in development. On the contrary, it is already possible to identify an interplay between individual and communal salvation, at least on the part of a monastic leader, alongside a concern for Spirit-guided exegesis, and salvation.[20] The contours of Gregory's future soteriological programme are already present. The one-souledness he referenced resurfaces on his arrival in Constantinople as a feature of corporate salvation of believers in community, the importance of Spirit-led scriptural interpretation, and the incitement to virtue as a consequence of a purifying life.[21]

Although the ideas were not to be fully developed until later, these early works demand close attention. Those of Gregory's orations composed between his ordination and his flight from elevation to the episcopacy (362 to the end of 369) help establish valuable context for seeing the shape of his early thought on salvation and on the Spirit's role in it. Gregory's *Ep*. 6 permits some concrete claims about the presence of investments in the activity of the Spirit in salvation, and even some indications of how they will play out. Although much of the development will appear to be rather dispersed, this is attributable to the complexity of the relationship between the Spirit and salvation more than to the immaturity of the ideas Gregory is presenting. This is especially clear in his first oration from Easter 362, delivered in his father's church at Nazianzus.

Gregory's first oration is not an introduction to a developed system of thought. Two themes run throughout: the believer's imitation of Christ and

[18] *Ep.* 6.3–4. Paul Gallway, ed, trans, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze: Lettres*, vol. 1 (Paris: Société D'Édition "*Les Belles Lettres,*" 1964), 7. Τίς ἀδελφῶν συμφυΐαν καὶ συμψυχίαν τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ θεουμένων καὶ ὑψουμένων; Τίς ἄμιλλαν ἀρετῆς καὶ παράθηξιν, ἢν ὅροις γραπτοῖς καὶ κανόσιν ἠσφαλισάμεθα; Τίς θείων λογίων φιλοπονίαν καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς φῶς εὑρισκόμενον σὺν ὁδηγίᾳ τοῦ Πνεύματος; Gregory is emphasising what he misses of Basil's monastery through rhetorical questions.

[19] See Syke's ascription of an assertion of full divinity of the Spirit from 372 to 373 and *Ep*. 58 to Basil as suggestive. Sykes, *Poemata Arcana*, 66.

[20] This assumes a reading of θεουμένων as soteriological.

[21] The reference to soul, rather than body, may be attributed to Gregory's anthropology as outlined in Chapter 1. The soul is of the Spirit, and divine in origin, as well as having intellectual authority.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

the mystery of the Spirit. This is not to say that the use of mystery is always equitable to the activity of the Spirit:

> I was anointed by mystery, I recoiled a little at mystery, enough to examine myself, and I enter along with a mystery, bringing the beautiful day with me as defence for my timidity and weakness, that he who rose from the dead today may raise me also up by his Spirit; and, clothing me with the new man, give his new creation to those who are begotten after God, as a good sculptor and teacher for Christ, readily dying with him and rising with him.[22]

Gregory wrote of three mysteries: one which anointed him, one from which he withdrew, and one which he brought with him. The latter two are accessible in context: Gregory withdrew from the call to ordination, and examined himself with reference to Moses, Jeremiah, and Aaron, who also vacillated in responding to calls from God.[23] The mystery that Gregory brought with him is that of the new creation, the resurrection, and recreation of man through and in Christ. This leaves the first mystery, which pertains to anointing. Lacking contextual or immediate textual evidence, one explanation presents itself: having just finished citing some prophets and patriarchs, Gregory is quoting another, from Isaiah 61:1 (referenced in Luke 4:18), "(The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me to bring good news to the afflicted [πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν με]."[24] Gregory abbreviated this, but the parallels are clear in his use of "[μ]υστήριον ἔχρισέ με."[25] Further, the anointing found in Isa 61:1, and in Jesus' quotation of the same in Luke 4:18, is for the proclamation of the good news, the very task Gregory was undertaking in delivering this oration. Thus, Gregory was anointed by the Spirit, withdrew from a call mediated by the Spirit, and then returned with a mystery that is realised in the believer through the Spirit. In this renewal by the Spirit, Gregory hoped to achieve his own recreation, so as to effectively imitate Christ for the benefit, or salvation per *Ep*. 6.3–4, of the congregation.

---

[22] *Or*. 1.2. SC 247, 74. Μυστήριον ἔχρισέ με, μυστηρίῳ μικρὸν ὑπεχώρησα, ὅσον ἐμαυτὸν ἐπισκέψασθαι· μυστηρίῳ καὶ συνεισέρχομαι, καλὴν ἐπαγόμενος τῆς ἐμῆς δειλίας καὶ ἀσθενείας ἐπίκουρον τὴν ἡμέραν, ἵν᾽ ὁ σήμερον ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστὰς κἀμὲ καινοποιήσῃ τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ τὸν καινὸν ἐνδύσας ἄνθρωπον, δῷ τῇ καινῇ κτίσει, τοῖς κατὰ Θεὸν γεννωμένοις, πλάστην ἀγαθὸν καὶ διδάσκαλον Χριστῷ καὶ συννεκρούμενον προθύμως καὶ συνανιστάμενον. The breadth of Gregory's biblical references in constructing this allusive but evocative passage is instructive. Jn 1.13, Rom 6.4, 2 Cor 5.17, Eph 4.24, Lk 4.18.

[23] *Or*. 1.1.

[24] *NASB*.

[25] Gregory could also have been referring to Luke 4:18, Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ, οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, which paraphrases Isa 61:6. The end result is the same.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

The call to imitate Christ in pursuit of salvation is predicated on Christ's own reception of humanity:

> He took the form of a slave that we might regain our freedom; he descended that we might be elevated; he was tempted that we might conquer; he was dishonoured that he might glorify; he died that he might save; he rose up that he might draw us to himself, we who were lying in the calamity of sin. Give all, offer all, to him who gave himself up a ransom and reconciliation on our behalf...[26]

Gregory goes on to exhort believers to "become like Christ, since Christ became like us. Become gods for his sake, since he became Man for ours. [Γενόμεθα ὡς Χριστός, ἐπεὶ καὶ Χριστὸς ὡς ἡμεῖς· γενώμεθα θεοὶ δι'αὐτόν, ἐιπειδὴ κἀκεῖνος δι' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος.]"[27] In the context of a sermon delivered at Easter, the embellished pseudo-credal form is not surprising.[28] Likewise, the language of becoming like Christ as he became like the believer is found throughout Gregory's soteriology.[29] The mystery remains the present concern, however. It is Christ who exalts, glorifies, saves, and draws the believer out of sin. The audience was exhorted to repay in kind, to become "gods for his sake." The mystery to which Gregory referred earlier in the passage can then only be read as the first mystery of *Or*. 1.2 – the Spirit. The attribution of the transformational capacity of the Spirit is not limited to these lines. In coming to the end of this short oration, Gregory wrote that "...and he offers you all that belongs to him. O magnificence! Or, for it would be truer to say, paternal love! His grey hair, his youth, the temple, the high priest, the testator, the heir, and the account which you desired; [...] those the Spirit writes, and engraves on stone tablets, or flesh, not superficially graven, and not easily erased, but marked deep, not with ink, but grace."[30] The Spirit is the engraver, the one who through grace realises the

---

[26] *Or*. 1.5. SC 247, 78. δούλου μορφὴν ἔλαβεν, ἵνα τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμεῖς ἀπολάβωμεν· κατῆλθεν, ἵν' ὑψωθῶμεν· ἐπειράσθη, ἵνα νικήσωμεν· ἠτιμάσθη, ἵνα δοξάσῃ· ἀπέθανεν, ἵνα σώσῃ· ἀνῆλθεν, ἵν' ἑλκύσῃ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἡμᾶς κάτω κειμένους ἐν τῷ τῆς ἁμαρτίας πτώματι. Πάντα διδότω τις, πάντα καρποφορείτω τῷ δόντι ἑαυτὸν λυτρὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἀντάλλαγμα· See also Or. 4.1.

[27] Ibid. The *NPNF* incorrectly reads "Γενώμεθα θεοὶ" as "Let us become God's…" *NPNF 7*, 203. See also Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, 91; Russell, *Deification*, 215; Torstein Tollefsen, "Theosis according to Gregory," in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (ed. Jostein Børtnes et al; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006), 266, n. 18.

[28] Beeley notes the framing of Gregory's prose corpus by resurrection-centred works, in *Ors*. 1 and 45. See Beeley, *Knowledge*, 59.

[29] Hofer, *Christ*, 84–85.

[30] *Or*. 1.6. SC 247, 78–80. καὶ πάντα προστίθησιν ὑμῖν τὰ ἑαυτοῦ, ὦ τῆς μεγαλοψυχίας, ἢ, τό γε ἀληθέστερον εἰπεῖν, τῆς φιλοτεκνίας, τὴν πολιὰν, τὴν νεότητα, τὸν ναὸν, τὸν ἀρχιερέα, τὸν κληροδότην, τὸν κληρονόμον, τοὺς λόγους οὓς ἐποθεῖτε· […] ἀλλ' οὓς γράφει τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ πλαξὶν ἐντυποῖ λιθίναις,

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

transformation prefigured by the "heir" and spoken of in the "discourses." This engraving is integral to the process of becoming a god, which is realised through the mysterious Spirit. Even at this early stage there is evidence of a linguistic association of the Spirit and salvation – mediated outside the language traditionally associated with deification, such as θέωσις. Instead, an abundance of language – exaltation, unity, mystery, and the engraving of virtue – which point to the involvement of the Spirit in a process of salvation in which the believer is deified.

On this basis, it is clear that Gregory had an early and durable understanding of the Spirit's role in salvation. Instead, it appears to be a process that is concerned with the individual, but which is fully capable of finding expression through what might be conceived of as communal agents, such as Gregory the priest. Winslow somewhat misunderstands this flexibility, even as he sets out a clear assessment of the Spirit's significance:

> It is for this reason that V. Lossky, in reflecting upon the patristic tradition regarding deification, has said: "...the idea of our ultimate deification cannot be expressed on a christological basis alone, but demands a pneumatological development of doctrine." This is eminently true of Gregory. [...] In such language we see Gregory making considerably more use of the "first person singular" than when discussing the economy of the incarnation. This lends weight to the statement that, whereas Christ saves man-kind, the Spirit perfects that salvation for the individual. That the Spirit is both God and deifier is an essential element, then, not only of Gregory's doctrine of the Trinity, but of his understanding of the economy of salvation. Yet it is in that most "individual" and "personal" of Christian rites, baptism, where Gregory sees the chief work of the Spirit as taking place.[31]

Winslow and Lossky separately highlight what was, in their respective periods, a critical lack of focus on the role of the Spirit. However, what Gregory sets out is not just the role of the Spirit in baptism. On the contrary, to locate the "chief work" of the Spirit to a single rite, as Winslow puts it, is to curtail the more enduring process which Gregory identifies through his engraving language in *Or*. 1.6. Although the process has a pivotal moment in baptism, it precedes and follows the rite in a process by which Gregory as priest, aided by the Spirit as the believer is also aided, engraves with grace.[32]

III. Language and the Community

The complexity of the concepts and language associating salvation as likeness to God and the Spirit is further emphasised in Gregory's second and third orations. Analysis of these orations will continue to develop a sense of the breadth of language at play, as *Or*. 2 also affords opportunity to see more

---

εἴτουν σαρκίναις, οὐκ ἐξ ἐπιπολῆς χαρασσομένους οὐδὲ ῥᾳδίως ἀπαλειφομένους, ἀλλ' εἰς βάθος ἐνσημαινομένους, οὐ μέλανι, ἀλλὰ χάριτι.

[31] Winslow, *Dynamics*, 130.

[32] Elm, "Inscriptions and Conversions," 15.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

directly how Gregory interacted with his sources. These are primarily scriptural throughout, but Gregory did not regard himself as bound by the letter but also by the consequences of further revelation – which is to say, the light to be found in them through the Spirit.[33] Gregory often appealed to the Spirit's aid in his reading of Scripture. However, the context of *Or*. 2 must be kept firmly in sight. This expansive work was most likely not delivered in its final form, having been edited after its original delivery. This is not too great a challenge, as those areas of interest are apparent in other early works, suggesting that they are likely to be contemporary with Gregory's *Or*. 3. This oration further reflected on the role of the Spirit in perfection as well as providing a demonstration of the complexity of language.

The first example of direct scriptural reference is concerned with the central argument of the text, and is demonstrably significant even at this early point: how the church is constituted, and how the clergy preside over the collective perfecting of congregants in the harmony of the Spirit. This is something to which Gregory will continue to return, and *Or*. 2 is a strong indication of the future trends that Gregory will pursue (or a further suggestion that he did expand the text of *Or*. 2 later in his career). There is a recurrence of the theme of the cleric exercising the power of the Spirit in an act of collective purification – one that will come to be paralleled with salvation. At the same time, there is the introduction of the Spirit into a biblical paraphrase from Ephesians 4:15, "we are to grow up in all aspects into Him who is the head, even Christ [αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός]," by which Gregory makes the following point: "just as limbs, they receive cohesion and consistency by the Spirit's harmony in a perfect body, truly worthy of Christ himself, our head [ὥσπερ ἐν μέλεσι καὶ τῇ ἁρμονίᾳ τοῦ πνεύματος συμβιβασθέντα καὶ συνδεθέντα ἓν ἄρτιον ἀποδειχθῇ σῶμα καὶ αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἡμῶν ὄντως ἄξιον]."[34] Growth into the worthiness of Christ, that is, the path towards salvation, is indicated in Eph 4:15, but in Gregory's remarks is mediated through the action of the Spirit. Gregory's use of ἁρμονίᾳ in this context points towards the biblical concept of joining, but also towards the Platonic ἁρμονίᾳ, and towards its mythical and musical connotations. Gregory engages in the same kind of Spirit-centred exegesis in *Or*. 2.7. In this case, something more complex is going on:

> For nothing seemed to me so desirable as to close my senses [...] by constantly coming to be a truly spotless mirror of God and divinity, as light is added to light, and darkness

[33] *Ep.* 6.3–4. Gallay, *Lettres* 1, 7. See also Hanson, *Search*, 782.
[34] *Or*. 2.3. SC 247, 90; *NASB*/*SBLGNT*.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

cleared, enjoying now by hope blessings of the future age, and accompanying the angels, already beyond the earth having forsaken the earth, and set on high by the Spirit.[35]

Rather than reading the Spirit's action into an existing passage, here Gregory takes two separate verses, 2 Cor 3:18 and Wisdom 7:26, allowing them to mutually interpret each other. The photological metaphor, light on light, will remain a consistent theme in Gregory's theological project.[36] Here, however, it acts to connect the image of Wisdom and the mirror of the divine in Wis 7:26 with the transformative action of the Spirit to make the believer like a mirror of the divine in 2 Cor 3:18. The final line, concerning the Spirit properly, itself appears to have been adapted from Revelation 21:10, or at least inspired by it, with the Spirit, rather than an angel, being the principal agent of setting on high.[37]

Gregory expanded on the role of the Spirit, and highlighted the direction of his "making God" language, further on:

> The second prescription is to give wings to the soul, seize it from the world, and give it to God, and protect what is in his image if it holds good, to lead it by the hand if in danger, restore it if wasted away, to make Christ to dwell in the heart by the Spirit: and, in sum, to make God, and give bliss to one who gives allegiance to heaven.[38]

Through this indwelling of Christ, which receives a metaphorical expression in the form of Θεὸν ποιῆσαι, the agent changes from the believer exercising faith to the Spirit inculcating that faith.[39] Bernardi suggests that the use of σύνταξις is intended to evoke the baptismal renunciation of Satan and pledg-

---

[35] *Or*. 2.7. SC 247, 96. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐδόκει μοι τοιοῦτον οἷον μύσαντα τὰς αἰσθήσεις, […] τῶν κάτω χαρακτήρων καὶ πλανωμένον, ὄντως ἔσοπτρον ἀκηλίδωτον Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ὂν καὶ ἀεὶ γινόμενον, φωτὶ προσλαμβάνοντα φῶς καὶ ἀμαυροτέρῳ τρανότερον, ἤδη τὸ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος ἀγαθὸν ταῖς ἐλπίσι καρπούμενον καὶ συμπεριπολεῖν ἀγγέλοις ἔτι ὑπὲρ γῆς ὄντα καταλιπόντα τὴν γῆν, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἄνω τιθέμενον. Some discretion is required concerning καὶ ἀμαυροτέρῳ τρανότερον. Bernardi points to *Or*. 20.1, which reuses elements of *Or*. 2, and expands on this, to read "et en substituant netteté à la confusion." This reading presents a possible alternative. SC 247, 96, n. 3.

[36] Beeley, *Trinity*, 90–133 on the consistency of illumination and light in Gregory's thought.

[37] See Panayiotis Tzamalikos, *An Ancient Commentary on the Book of Revelation: A Critical Edition of the* Scholia in Apocalypsin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) on Gregory's exclusion of Revelation from his basic canon, but also his reuse of language.

[38] *Or*. 2.22. SC 247, 118–20. τῇ δὲ τὸ προκείμενον πτερῶσαι ψυχὴν, ἁρπάσαι κόσμου καὶ δοῦναι Θεῷ καὶ τὸ κατ᾽ εἰκόνα ἢ μένον τηρῆσαι ἢ κινδυνεῦον χειραγωγῆσαι ἢ διαῤῥυὲν ἀνασώσασθαι, εἰσοικίσαι τε τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον, Θεὸν ποιῆσαι καὶ τῆς ἄνω μακαριότητος τὸν τῆς ἄνω συντάξεως. The likely biblical referent is 1 Cor 13.2.

[39] See *Or*. 2.97 on the paralleling of the indwelling of Christ and the Spirit. Also Althaus, *Heilslehre*, 142–45.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

ing of allegiance to Christ.[40] Such an evocation would imply that Gregory had in mind a clear connection between the role of the priest, the power of the Spirit, and the baptismal act. At the same time, the absence of an explicit association shows that Gregory did not want to isolate the role of the Spirit, through the priest, to make a believer God in the moment of baptism. The power of the priest to deify believers is reiterated later, this time without a clear biblical parallel, or the Spirit: "and share the priesthood of Christ, who will renew the creature, who will set forth the image, and will produce inhabitants for the world above, and greatest of all, be God, and make gods [καὶ Χριστῷ συνιερεύσοντα, τὸν ἀναπλάσοντα τὸ πλάσμα καὶ παραστήσοντα τὴν εἰκόνα καὶ τῷ ἄνω κόσμῳ δημιουργήσοντα καὶ τὸ μεῖζον εἰπεῖν Θεὸν ἐσόμενον, καὶ θεοποιήσοντα]?"[41] The emphatic association of salvation, and deification language, with the role of the priest is reinforced elsewhere in the oration.[42] The comments in these passages strongly prefigure those to be found in Nazianzus' oration on baptism, where the progressive nature of salvation is stressed.[43] Rather than a sudden change, even at this early stage Gregory clearly held the view that the process of salvation was precisely that – a gradual process abetted by personal asceticism or communal teaching. However, some caution should be exercised concerning Gregory's statements about the priestly class and salvation.

In trying to isolate Gregory's deification vocabulary, Russell highlights a number of neologisms and rhetorical flourishes Gregory employs and rightly points out that Winslow did not appreciate the "novelty" of θέωσις – bearing in mind that, unlike Winslow, Russell does not ascribe novelty to the content of the word.[44] However, both overlook the significance of the allusive references, especially in these early orations, which characterise associations of the Spirit with the soteriological category of deification. The association of priest, Spirit, and deification in *Or*. 2.22 and elsewhere further problematises making clear connections. Opperwall's reading of *Or*. 2.22 highlights the issue: "Thus, for Gregory, pastors work through the Spirit to make individual Christians the dwelling place of Christ, and to establish the possibility of θέωσις among them."[45] Even Opperwall's reading suggests an implied ambi-

[40] Bernardi, SC 247,120.

[41] *Or*. 2.73. SC 247, 186.

[42] *Or*. 2.28; 2.40.

[43] Elm, "Inscriptions and Conversions," 19 expands on the idea of purification as a process for Nazianzus, contrary to the view of immediate and final purification held by some of his contemporaries.

[44] Russell, *Deification*, 214 and Winslow, *Dynamics*, 179.

[45] Opperwall, "Holy Spirit," 30. On Gregory as pastor see Brian Daley, "Saint Gregory of Nazianzus as Pastor and Theologian," in *Loving God with Our Minds: The Pastor as Theologian; Essays in Honor of Wallace M. Alston* (ed. Michael Welker et al; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 106ff.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

guity concerning who, exactly, is responsible for deification. While, on the basis of *Ep*. 6 and *Or*. 2, an argument could be mounted that it is the leaders of the community, the agency of the Spirit cannot be overlooked. Some clarity can be found in Gregory's own comments during this period in *Or*. 3, where he wrote that he was taken from his "Citadel Solitude" which he had embraced "as accomplice and mother of the divine ascent, and making gods [καὶ ὡς συνεργὸν καὶ μητέρα τῆς θείας ἀναβάσεως, καὶ θεοποιὸν]."[46] It seems implausible that the Spirit would deify Gregory personally, even through ascetic practice, but then require a secondary agent in the case of the community. Rather, Gregory himself, and it can be inferred from *Ep*. 6 that Basil as well, is able to act as he does because he is more purified than those to whom he ministered. Regardless, some mediation is required, whether in ascetic isolation or the aid of a priest so purified. On these grounds, Gregory's allusion to scriptural texts expounded with references to the Spirit, and the attendant expansion in salvation language, becomes somewhat more comprehensible. All action in progressing toward must be mediated by the Spirit personally, as it were. Gregory states this directly and allusively, respectively, in two passages in *Or*. 2. In the first, he wrote, "now and forever, by the great worth of the Spirit, by whom alone God is understood, perceived, and heard."[47]

Later, speaking of the biblical text, he wrote that he extended "the accuracy of the Spirit to the least apostrophe or stroke [μέχρι τῆς τυχούσης κεραίας καὶ γραμμῆς τοῦ πνεύματος τὴν ἀκρίβειαν ἕλκοντες]."[48] The "accuracy of the Spirit" referred not to a modern concept of literalism, but to the mutually reinforcing concepts of the text's inspiration and the necessity of the Spirit's aid in reading the text. That is to say, as evinced in *Ep*. 6, that the Spirit inspired interpretation of the text, as well as its writing. Even the abundance of deification terms identified by Bernardi fail to take account of, and can in fact obfuscate, the number of references to the Spirit's soteriological capacity to be found in Gregory's biblical allusion. Further, Scripture was not the only source for Gregory's language. As Maslov has demonstrated, Gregory's language owes much to a diverse philosophical background. It is diminished by reduction to a simple set of figures of speech derived by implying the application of Platonic thought to biblical text.[49] The need for careful navigation of Gregory's language is nowhere clearer than in *Or*. 4.

[46] *Or*. 3.1. SC 247, 242.

[47] *Or*. 2.39. SC 247, 140. ὅσον ἄξιον, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ νῦν ἀεὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος ᾧ μόνῳ Θεὸς καὶ νοεῖται καὶ ἑρμηνεύεται καὶ ἀκούεται.

[48] *Or*. 2.105. SC 247, 224. This may be an allusion to Mt 5:18: ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία, but if so Gregory lost the force of its reference to the top and bottom of a letter.

[49] Maslov, "The Limits of Platonism," 440–41.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

B. Questioning Technical Language

I. Bounding Θέωσις

In approaching *Or*. 4, delivered in 364, with a view towards Gregory's language concerning the interaction of Sprit and salvation, his first use of θέωσις looms large. However, since Gregory is the only Cappadocian to use θέωσις its significance in his thought has been consistently overstated due to its importance in later interlocutors. In attempting to trace the genealogy of θέωσις, Maslov convincingly argues that the language itself has been overlooked "in pursuit of the signified."[50] While this point is valid, as is the considerably greater part of Maslov's arguments for Gregory's process in applying the deification category of salvation to individuals, there is a question as to Maslov's location of "self-conscious innovation" in the word itself, rather than in Gregory's thought more generally.[51] This inquiry into Gregory's early language has so far been restricted only to his earliest works; as such, it cannot be accused of reading later developments into him, particularly when it has been noted that the concept of deification as individual salvation in Gregory predates his use of θέωσις in *Or*. 4 by at least two years.[52] Although it contains no references to the Spirit, and little to no other salvation metaphors, *Or*. 4 remains worthy of attention not just for the introduction of θέωσις but because the term's use here points directly to the complexity of Gregory's salvation language. In drawing this out, Maslov makes two contributions, one valuable and the other more problematic. Maslov, following Elm, highlights Gregory's intent in *Or*. 4 to reclaim Greek *paideia* for Christian ends, against Julian's own claims. Maslov notes also that Gregory's first use of θέωσις in this text is negative, and refers to the false deification of Pagan philosophers.[53] However, this points towards a problem in Maslov's own argument that the "force of θέωσις must have made it dangerously close to the pagan idea of ἀποθεώσις."[54] Given Gregory's initial attribution of θέωσις to pagan philosophers, it is possible that it may not be "dangerously" close so much as being merely in proximity. Ἀποθεώσις as a term, though not the Pagan concept entire, was a component of Christian deification language in Cappadocia, at least for Gregory Thaumaturgus, who wrote in his panegyric for Origen:

> But that this is the true work of prudence, and that it is the divine prudence is well told by the ancients; for in this there is one virtue truly common to God and to man, just as the

[50] Ibid., 441.

[51] Ibid., 443.

[52] For a critical analysis of *Or*. 4, see Lugaresi, *Gregorio Di Nazianzo, Contro Giuliano l'Apostata, Orazione IV*.

[53] Elm, *Fathers*, 336–77; Maslov, "Limits of Platonism," 446; *Or*. 4.59.

[54] Maslov, "Limits of Platonism," 443.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

soul is exercised beholding itself as in a mirror, and reflects the divine mind in itself, if worthy of this union and affinity, and traces out some ineffable way for the attaining of a kind of apotheosis.[55]

Nothing in this would have seemed objectionable to Gregory Nazianzen who, in *Or*. 2.7 not long before this, asserted a desire to become a "mirror of God and divine things." On these grounds, Maslov's attempt to support Winslow's claim that Gregory employed defensive language around later uses of θέωσις on the basis of its resonances are diminished. Instead, such caution would seem to stem from Gregory's own awareness that he is expressing provocative ideas, rather than merely using provocative language.[56] Holding in mind the fairly expansive sweep of salvation language already seen in Gregory's early work, *Or*. 4 and the use of θέωσις – however important for later thought – offer only another perspective on the same experience of salvation as other, alternative language.

All of Gregory's thought on salvation up to this point is brought to bear against Julian's apostasy, but his comments in *Or*. 2 on this issue are especially pertinent. These comments prefigure the imperial fall from grace. Having contended on behalf of salvation and been a man of standing and character, Julian's failure to shoulder the burden is all the more damning.[57] However, as part of an acid anecdote concerning Julian's practice of sacrifice, Gregory raised a singularly interesting point in his early thought: that God creates new ways of salvation.[58] This notion is one which will recur with greater

[55] *Pan*. 11. *PG* 10, 1084C. Τὸ δὲ εἶναι ὄντως ἔργον φρονήσεως, καὶ ταύτην εἶναι τὴν θείαν φρόνησιν καλῶς τοῖς παλαιοῖς λέγεται· τὴν αὐτὴν ὄντως οὖσαν θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου ἀρετήν, αὐτῆς τῆς ψυχῆς ἑαυτὴν ὥσπερ ἐν κατόπτρῳ ὁρᾶν μελετώσης καὶ τὸν θεῖον νοῦν, εἰ ἀξία γένοιτο τῆς κοινωνίας τῆσδε, ἐν αὐτῇ κατοπτριζομένης ὁδόν τε ἀπόρρητόν τινα ταύτης ἀποθεώσεως ἐξιχνευομένης. Gregory Thaumaturgus' use of this language is highlighted by Russell, though not developed further. Russell, *Deification*, 236. On the deification of philosophers see John Lenz, "Deification of the Philosopher in Classical Greece," *Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions* (ed. Michael Christensen et al; Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007), 50–53.

[56] Without suggesting that this is Maslov's intent, care must be taken not to diminish the strength of Gregory's commitment to the idea of deification, whatever the metaphors expressing different elements of it. Tollefsen is instructive in this regard, cautioning that scholarship should not "weaken the strong impression made by the language of deification." See Tollefsen, *Theosis*, 270. Likewise, it is worth noting that in navigating between Pagan and Christian ideas of deification, that which one is said to be becoming can differ substantially. See also Paul L. Gavrilyuk, "The Retreival of Deificatoin: How a Once-Despised Archaism Became an Ecumenical Desideratrum," *Modern Theology* 25, no. 4 (2009): 649.

[57] See McGuckin, *Gregory*, 98 for an extended analysis of Gregory's view on enlightened aristocratic church leadership.

[58] *Or*. 4.54.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

force and frequency throughout Gregory's later soteriological language, and which will become inextricably bound up with the action of the Spirit in the life of the believer and the providential nature of God's will.[59] The examples Gregory cites elsewhere in *Or*. 4 are not alien to the fuller descriptions he provides in *Or*. 2, or elsewhere in his early work. On the contrary, when his use of θέωσις is brought to bear, yet more parallels to his earlier works appear: "who is pure, and purifies; because they know no limit in ascension or deification…[60] Parallels can be drawn with *Or*. 1.4–5, as well as the references in *Or*. 2.22 and 2.33 – whether in the case of ascetic practice as part of the movement towards God, the shedding of earthly desire, and as having light added to light. On the basis of such thematic similarities, issue must be taken with Maslov's distinction between θέωσις and θεοποίησις: "As it is used by Gregory, *theōsis* – similarly to *oikeiōsis pros theon* – posits the attainment of the divine as ethical process, which can never be brought to completion. By contrast theopoiēsis, in addition to the mechanistic, non-organic idea of fabrication, appears to put emphasis on the benevolent activity of God by whose grace, through the incarnation of the Logos, the human has already, in some sense, been made divine."[61]

While it is possible to offer assent and support for Maslov's argument concerning familiarisation of the mortal to the divine as part of human remaking in Gregory's thought, and to his characterisation of this process as "ethical," his attempt to divide θέωσις and θεοποίησις unnecessarily complicates Gregory's thought and is without basis in Gregory's own writings.[62] This is not to imply that Maslov is wrong that Gregory thought differently about salvation than his antecedents and contemporaries. Athanasius almost certainly meant something different from Gregory when he used language suggestive of being made God, but Gregory's own use of the term does not imply he vested it with the same meaning as Athanasius. An apt comparison is found in Marcellus' use of Jn 15:26 and procession to affirm the divinity of the Spirit. Gregory uses similar arguments and the same text, but he surely does not mean to imply what Marcellus does, except in so far as it involves the same expansion on the divinity of the Spirit.[63] However, Maslov's lexical position is problematised by the use of language other than θέωσις in Gregory's earlier work, e.g. Θεὸν ποιῆσαι in *Or*. 2.22, θεουμένων in *Ep*. 6.4, and

[59] *Ors*. 2.22, 33, 40; 4.88.

[60] *Or*. 4.71. SC 309, 184. ὧν ἡ κάθαρσις καὶ ὧν τὸ καθαίρεσθαι, μηδὲν μέτρον εἰδότων ἀναβάσεως καὶ θεώσεως…

[61] Maslov, "Limits of Platonism," 452.

[62] This presupposes a reading of ethical as pointing towards the divine as ultimate good. For some considerations in this area see Stanley S. Harakas, "Presuppositions for Ethical Method in St. Gregory the Theologian's Five *Theological Orations*," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 55, no. 1 (2010): 99.

[63] See *Fr*. 68 of *Ast*., as well as the discussion in Chapter 1.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

most problematically for Maslov, as θεοποιὸν in *Or*. 3.1. Unless a distinction is drawn between Gregory's description of Christian philosophy in *Or*. 4.71 and the account of his own practice in *Or*. 3.1 as "ethical" in one case and "mechanistic" in the other, Maslov's conceptual distinction between the two is not as strong as the surrounding argument.[64] This is compounded when Gregory's account of his philosophical life in *Or*. 3.1 is directly compared with that of Christians generally in *Or*. 4.71. In the latter, it ends "ἀναβάσεως καὶ θεώσεως," whereas in the former it ends "ἀναβάσεως καὶ θεοποιὸν." However convincing Maslov's argument concerning the logic underlying θέωσις, his attempt to distinguish it from θεοποίησις breaks down when comparing texts written less than a year apart.[65] Rather than attempting to create an artificial distinction, it must be recognised that θέωσις and θεοποίησις are interchangeable metaphors for Gregory, except in so far as the former serves to challenge Julian's derogation of Christian philosophy. Both concern the rebalancing of human nature to emphasise the superiority of the divine soul.[66]

Having identified such a serious problem with a certain distinction between the two terms, it is clear that while θέωσις is a novel linguistic contribution on Gregory's part, it is not a radical departure from his thinking up to this point. However, Maslov is right that a distinction can and should be drawn between Gregory's applications of the underlying concepts from his forebears.[67] Θέωσις as a neologism helps highlight Gregory's departure from earlier deification language. However, his own use of earlier language should not be seen as suggesting an internal development of doctrine but rather of expression. Indeed, it should be remembered that thematic parallels between the use of θέωσις in *Or*. 4 and earlier salvation metaphors do more than complicate the use of language. They also help highlight the role of the Spirit in those actions which Gregory views as leading to ascension: it is thus not just the mere practice of asceticism that leads to deification but the action of the Spirit in the one who undertakes them. Moving beyond *Or*. 4, the takea-

[64] Maslov, "Limits of Platonism," 452.

[65] Maslov does not engage with the content of *Or*. 3. It would seem that his understanding of θεοποίησις is constructed in light of those sources he references outside of Gregory. The preceding argument should not necessarily be taken as a comment upon the use of θεοποίησις in any figure except Gregory, as Maslov's comments may have force in other cases. Though outside the remit of this section, there is an additional example in *Or*. 31.4. See Chapters 4 and 5 for a discussion of these lines.

[66] On the philosophical underpinnings of this debate see in particular Ruether, *Rhetor*, 158–64; and Elm, *Fathers*, 378–80.

[67] A further caveat should be placed on more recent reception of this language: while clarity is poorly served by a catch-all translation of deification, that lack is not resolved by imposing more rigid boundaries on Gregory's original usages.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

way should be that there is something new here, and that the ethical, broadly defined, capacity of the believer is an important part of this.

As discussed in the previous section on *Or*. 4, concerning the coherence of meaning between θέωσις and θεοποίησις, there are clear connections between the individual action of the Spirit in *Ors*. 1 and 3, the communal action of the Spirit through the priest in *Or*. 2 and *Ep.* 6, and the ideal image presented in *Or*. 4, even when individual elements of language are absent. Whether the presence of the Spirit is explicit or implicit, there are a number of core concepts and metaphors which signal its involvement: illumination, purification, perfection, θέωσις, and θεοποίησις being among the most identifiable. *Or*. 6, also delivered in 364, introduce a further concept that follows the same logic: the harmonisation in believers in the church.[68] While, for example, ascension and deification are clearly metaphors of salvation that incorporate the Spirit, harmony and harmonisation express the action of the Spirit in the believer directly. In opening this oration, Gregory offers a Spirit-focused passage that addresses the role of the Spirit in establishing the behaviour that required him to speak and allowed him to do so:

> An ardent sense of purpose unfetters my tongue, and because of the law of the Spirit I turn my back on the law of men, and to peace I offer my words [...] I thought that the priorities of the Spirit were first to purify myself through the practice of philosophy; next, to open the mouth of my mind and draw in the Spirit; then to utter a goodly theme, and to speak God's perfect wisdom among them that are perfect.[69]

Those to whom Gregory was speaking were said to be "attuned in a single harmony, that of the Spirit and the good..."[70] Expanding further on the role of the Spirit in the congregation, Gregory wrote that:

> [I]nstead, the members have the same care for one another in accordance with the order and bond of nature that has bound and preserves all things through one another, and we have come forth one body and one Spirit, just as we have been called to the one hope that belongs to our call.[71]

---

[68] On peace in *Or*. 6, see Neil McLynn, "Gregory the Peacemaker: A Study of Oration Six." *Kyoyo-Ronso*, 101 (1996): 183–216.

[69] *Or*. 6.1, trans. Vinson, 3, alt. SC 405, 120–22. Λύει μου τὴν γλῶτταν ἡ προθυμία, καὶ περιφρονῶ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον νόμον διὰ τὸν νόμον τοῦ Πνεύματος· καὶ δίδωμι τῇ εἰρήνῃ τὸν λόγον […] τότε μὲν δὴ φυλακὴν ἐθέμην τοῖς χείλεσιν, οὐδ' ἄλλως προθύμοις οὖσι περὶ τὸν λόγον, ὅτι τῇ δι' ἔργων φιλοσοφίᾳ καθᾶραι πρῶτερον ἑαυτὸν, εἶτα τὸ στόμα τῆς διανοίας ἀνοίξας ἑλκῦσαι πνεῦμα, εἶτα "ἐξερεύξασθαι λόγον ἀγαθὸν," καὶ "λαλεῖν Θεοῦ σοφίαν" τελείαν "ἐν τοῖς τελείοις," ἀκολουθίας εἶναι πνευματικῆς ὑπελάμβανον· As a referent, see 1 Cor 2:6.

[70] Or. 6.7, trans. Vinson, 8. SC 405, 138. καὶ μίαν ἁρμονίαν ἡρμοσμένα τὴν τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος·

[71] *Or*. 6.8, trans. Vinson, 9. SC 405, 142. ἀλλὰ "τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων μεριμνῶσι τὰ μέλη" τάξει καὶ θεσμῷ φύσεως, τῷ δι' ἀλλήλων τὰ πάντα συνδήσαντι καὶ

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

This attunement, to the Spirit and "the good," points to a process of personal purification through the Christian philosophy to which Gregory alluded in *Or*. 4. What follows is a reception of the power of the Spirit leading to perfection, and ultimately to the image of a thriving church in which the believer is nourished by word and Spirit. Critically, however, the community so harmonised receives these things as externals. They are not constitutive of them being, but merely represent the ideal state of such.

This multiplicity carries through in Gregory's oration on love for the poor, delivered shortly after *Or*. 6, and in a similar context. Building up to the love of the poor as the greatest virtue, Gregory wrote that "Each of these [virtues] forms a single road to salvation, which has as its certain destination one of the blessed and everlasting abodes; for just as there is a wide variety of goals in life so in God's house also there are many rooms, assigned and distributed on the basis of individual merit."[72] While this might serve as the basis for speculation about Gregory having possessed a universalist view of salvation, it is more prudent to locate this in the context established in the first two chapters. Salvation is certainly extended to everyone, in so far as salvation is made possible for everyone.

The attainment of virtue has already been associated with the activity of the Spirit in *Or*. 2.7, but Gregory alludes further to the imitation or indwelling of Christ and attainment of virtue mediated by the Spirit in *Or*. 14.7:

> [w]hose inner nature has put on the same Christ and who have been entrusted with the same guarantee of the Spirit as we who have been given to share with us the same laws, prophecies, testaments, liturgies, sacraments, hopes; for whom Christ, who takes away the sin of all the world, died just as he did for us; who are fellow heirs of the life in heaven, even if they have met with so much misfortune here on earth; who are buried with Christ and raised with him, provided they suffer with him in order that they may also be glorified with him.[73]

φυλάξαντι· καὶ πεφήναμεν ἓν σῶμα καὶ πνεῦμα ἓν καθὼς καὶ κεκλήμεθα "ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως." 1 Cor 12:15; Eph 4:4.

[72] *Or*. 14.5, trans. Vinson, 42. *PG* 35, 864B. Τούτων ἕκαστον μία τις σωτηρίας ὁδὸς, καὶ πρός τινα τῶν μονῶν πάντως φέρουσα τῶν αἰωνίων καὶ μακαρίων· ἐπειδὴ ὥσπερ διάφοροι βίων αἱρέσεις, οὕτω καὶ μοναὶ πολλαὶ παρὰ Θεῷ, κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἑκάστῳ μεριζόμεναί τε καὶ διαι ρούμεναι· See *Or*. 14.2 on Rahab's hospitality winning her salvation.

[73] *Or*. 14.14, trans. Vinson, 49. *PG* 35, 876A–B. οἱ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐνδεδυμένοι Χριστὸν κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν πιστευθέντες ἀῤῥαβῶνα τοῦ Πνεύ ματος· οἱ τῶν αὐτῶν ἡμῖν μετασχόντες νόμων, λογίων, διαθηκῶν, συνάξεων, μυστηρίων, ἐλπίδων· ὑπὲρ ὧν Χριστὸς ὁμοίως ἀπέθανεν, ὁ παντὸς αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου· οἱ συγκληρονόμοι τῆς ἄνω ζωῆς, καὶ εἰ παραπολὺ τῆς ἐνταῦθα δι ήμαρτον· οἱ συνθαπτόμενοι Χριστῷ, καὶ συνανιστάμενοι· εἴπερ συμπάσχουσιν, ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶσιν. This passage is effectively an exposition of Paul. See Rom 8:17, 13:14; Gal 3:27.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

In his first invective against Julian, Gregory wrote that God may have been setting novel ways to salvation in front of even the apostate emperor.[74] To take up the path to salvation set before the believer is, however, a conscious act for Gregory.[75] As informative as such descriptions would appear to be, one of the principle metaphors of Spirit-driven salvation needs to be kept in sight:

> God has been merciful in the greatest ways, giving us in addition to everything else law and the prophets... ultimately surrendering himself to redeem the life of the world; blessing us with apostles, evangelists, teachers, pastors, healings, miracles, restoration to life, abolition of death, triumph over him who prevailed over us, covenants, one in figure, one in realisation, gifts of the Holy Spirit, the mystery of the new salvation.[76]

At this point in Gregory's thought, salvation – which is to say the referent of all these metaphors – remains submerged in mystery. Gregory's early perspectives on salvation are rich with opportunities for speculation in countless directions. When set side by side, however, they amount more to a cautionary tale than to an exposition. As much remains concealed as is revealed. Ultimately, this network of metaphors relies upon revelation to the believer through scriptural reading by way of the Spirit: "I find a similar sense of mystery in Scripture although it would take long to enumerate all the expressions of the Spirit that lead me to this conclusion."[77]

Gregory had cause to develop the idea of salvation in suffering, in the death of his sister, his brother, and then in his sense of betrayal by his friend, Basil. With the deaths of his siblings, Gorgonia and Caesarius, in 370 Gregory composed their funeral orations, probably delivered on the anniversary of their deaths in 371. Although the theme of salvation and the Spirit runs through both of them, his oration on Caesarius is focused on the contrast between the pursuit God in salvation and the pursuit of greatness in this life.

---

[74] *Or*. 4.54. Vasiliki Limberis, "'Religion' as the Cipher for Identity: The Cases of Emperor Julian, Libanius, and Gregory of Nazianzus," *Harvard Theological Review* 93, no. 4 (2000): 378 offers a valuable and largely sensitive treatment of Julian's self-understanding that may explain Gregory's riposte.

[75] On the nexus between salvation and charity in Gregory's thought see D. Winslow, "Gregory of Nazianzus and Love for the Poor," *Anglican Theological Review* 35 (1965): 357–58.

[76] *Or*. 14.27, trans. Vinson, 59–60. *PG* 35, 893A. Ὁ μὲν ἠλέησεν εἰς τὰ μέγιστα, δοὺς ἐπὶ πᾶσι νόμον, προφήτας, […] λύτρον ἑαυτὸν παρα δοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς· χαρισάμενος ἀπο στόλους, εὐαγγελιστὰς, διδασκάλους, ποιμένας, ἰά σεις, τέρατα, ἐπάνοδον πρὸς ζωὴν, θανάτου κατάλυσιν, τρόπαιον κατὰ τοῦ νικήσαντος, διαθήκην τὴν ἐν σκιᾷ, διαθήκην τὴν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, Πνεύματος ἁγίου με ρισμοὺς, τὸ τῆς καινῆς σωτηρίας μυστήριον. See also Beeley, *Knowledge*, 154.

[77] *Or*. 14.30, trans. Vinson, 63. *PG* 35, 897C. Εὑρίσκω γάρ τι καὶ τοιοῦτο ἐν τῇ θείᾳ Γραφῇ μυστήριον· καὶ μακρὸν ἂν εἴη πάσας ἀπαριθμεῖν τοῦ Πνεύματος τὰς φωνὰς, αἵ με πρὸς τοῦτο φέρουσιν.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

This distinction is at times taken up indirectly, with Gregory having written that "[it] is no small thing, having chosen the second life, to lay claim to virtue, and have more account of God and his own salvation than lowly splendour [οὐ μικρὸν δὲ εἴ τις, τὸν δεύτερον προστησάμενος βίον, καλοκαγαθίας μεταποιοῖτο, καὶ πλείω λόγον ἔχοι Θεοῦ καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίας ἢ τῆς κάτω λαμπρότητος·]."[78] Elsewhere, the same distinction directly addresses the choices made by Caesarius, as when Gregory wrote that fear guided Caesarius to salvation, and he "changed to another court [καὶ ἀμείψας ἑαυτῷ τὰ βασίλεια]."[79] In both cases, Gregory alludes to Caesarius' departure from the imperial court of Julian, Gregory's regard for which has already been seen, and return to his familial estates.

This personal character is supplemented by a return to a now familiar theme, which will only grow more relevant for Gregory's soteriology – that is to say, the role of the therapeutic action of suffering in individual salvation, on which he wrote that his audience should "give thanks for the whole: for the familiar and for the strange: I mean pleasant and painful, for the Scriptures know these are often weapons of salvation... [ἐπὶ πᾶσιν εὐχαριστοῦντες δεξιοῖς τε ὁμοίως καὶ ἀριστεροῖς, ἡδέσι λέγω καί ἀνιαροῖς, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ταῦτα σωτηρίας ὅπλα πολλάκις οἶδεν ὁ Λόγος...]"[80] Gregory would ascribe, to his own suffering, a capacity for spiritual progress. In encountering the suffering caused by the death of his brother, Gregory is made surer of his desire for a salvation whose fulfilment lies beyond death.[81] As in *Or*. 1.2, and in the closing of *Or*. 6, mystery is again the focus, but here the association of the mystery with salvation itself is spelled out.

The importance of suffering in salvation, and the role of the Spirit therein, is not passed over in his sister. Although there is much speculation on why Gregory demonstrated less personal familiarity in his sister's funeral oration – whether that he had little actual contact with his sister after her marriage or that it was an exercise in impersonal hagiography for other reasons – it is not especially pertinent here.[82] Setting aside any concerns about personal familiarity, Gregory at least made it clear that it was a "common struggle for salva-

[78] *Or*. 7.9. SC 405, 202.

[79] *Or*. 7.15. SC 405, 216.

[80] *Or*. 7.24. SC 405, 240–42. Ὁμοίως and ἀριστεροῖς are problematic, but the general sense is of good and bad. The translation above tries to capture both the sense and the meaning. See also *Or*. 6.17.

[81] *Or*. 7.23.

[82] On the subject of their relationship, Raymond van Dam, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003): 93–6; on Gorgonia in Gregory's *Or*. 8 see McGuckin, *Gregory*, 166–68.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

tion" in which his audience was engaged, divorced from gender.[83] This universalising of his comments on salvation allowed Gregory to go on to offer some explicit speculation on the subject of salvation and the Spirit. He wrote the following of Gorgonia:

> She had recently obtained herself the blessing of purification and perfection, which we have received from God as a common gift and foundation of a second life. Or rather, her entire life was purification and perfection: and while she possessed regeneration from the Holy Spirit, she had assurance from the actions of her life. And for her alone, I dare say, the mystery was a seal, rather than a favour.[84]

While the mystery to which Gregory referred is that of baptism and the transfiguration of fallen humanity by the imputation of the Spirit – taken in line with *Or*. 7.23 and the discussion of mystery in *Or*. 1.2 as well as, critically, *Or*. 14.27 – it is possible to see the significance of the division between security and seal in this passage.[85] While Gregory regards it unique to his sister that baptism was a seal rather than a favour for her, the possibility of the Spirit precedes that. That is to say, the mystery is the new salvation made possible for the individual through the Paraclete. Even this, however, exists as part of a linguistic complex reliant on metaphors that depend on the activity of the Spirit in a manner that precedes baptism, as has been the case with so much of Gregory's early thought.

II. Conclusion

This chapter has addressed the complexity of Gregory's salvation language, and the place of the Spirit within it. First, examining Gregory's early works, *Ep*. 6 and *Ors*. 1–3, demonstrated the first uses of salvation language in connection with the Spirit, and the importance of that connection. The Spirit sits at the heart of a network of metaphors: harmony, being made God, purification, mystery, and more. These are properly called metaphors in so far as they represent elaborations on emergent experience. Gregory himself experienced the Spirit moving him towards a salvation he understood as likeness to God. His language developed to provide metaphorical extensions to an experience

[83] *Or*. 8.15. Verna Harrison, "Greek Patristic Foundations of Trinitarian Anthropology," *Pro Ecclesia* 14, no. 4 (2004): 399–413.

[84] *Or*. 8.20. SC 405, 290. Αὐτῇ μὲν οὖν ὑπόγυον τὸ τῆς καθάρσεως καὶ τελειώσεως ἀγαθὸν ἦν, ἣν κοινὴν δωρεὰν, καὶ δευτέρου βίου κρηπῖδα παρὰ Θεοῦ πάντες λαβόντες ἔχομεν. Μᾶλλον δὲ πᾶς ὁ βίος κάθαρσις ἦν αὐτῇ καὶ τελείωσις· καὶ τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως εἶχεν ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος, τὸ δ' ἀσφαλὲς ταύτης ἐκ τῶν προβεβιωμένων. Καὶ μόνῃ σχεδὸν, ἵν' εἴπω τολμήσας, σφραγὶς, ἀλλ' οὐ χάρισμα ἦν τὸ μυστήριον.

[85] By *Or*. 14.27, the Spirit is the "mystery of the new salvation (σωτηρίας μυστήριον)" rather forcefully associating baptism with the Spirit, rather than the converse.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

that sits at the threshold of language.[86] No individual metaphor is sufficient to describe that experience. This was further borne out in the examination of *Or*. 4, where it was demonstrated that attempts to elevate θέωσις from a single metaphor to a referent in itself are not supportable even within the limited context of Gregory's early works. In *Ors*. 6 and 14, even after the introduction of θέωσις language, Gregory maintained a variously expressed system of salvation metaphors which all relate back to the Spirit's action in the believer. In closing consideration of Gregory's language, and this period of his work, the more refined deployment of these concepts in the funeral orations for his father and sister were examined. These orations were delivered in a very different context and demonstrate the relative complexity of the pedagogical or rhetorical metaphors used elsewhere.[87]

To ascribe unique status to an individual term when other metaphors are active in Gregory's early works is to circumscribe the role of the Spirit's action in salvation for Gregory. While θέωσις may be said to be a relatively direct metaphor for salvation – likeness or affiliation to God – this is only true in so far as Gregory allowed for any language to approach the mysterious. That it exists does not give license to denigrate or ignore other metaphors that are more to the point, whether allusive or direct. When such language is correctly located as part of a complex, developing discourse on salvation, the importance of the Spirit is more readily apparent. The durability of this language and ideation, and the consequence of its centrality to his thought, comprises the subject of the next chapter.

[86] Lakoff et al, *Metaphors*, 74.

[87] On the sources of language and thought in Gregory's funeral orations see Justin Mossay, *La Mort et L'au-Delà Dans Saint Grégoire de Nazianze* (Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1966).

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Chapter 3

Salvation and the Spirit in Gregory and Basil's Divisions

Chapter 3 covers a much shorter period of time, between 372 and 374, but is somewhat denser for being focused almost entirely on the question of Gregory's relationship with Basil of Caesarea. The most basic issue at hand is the exact the nature of the dispute in *Ep*. 58. This problem has seen various disparate framings, but this chapter will posit that any answer requires far greater nuance than has traditionally been applied. This will be achieved by utilising the historical background of Chapter 1 and the linguistic background of Chapter 2 to re-read the literary context surrounding Basil's elevation to the see of Caesarea, and Gregory's elevation to the see of Sasima, as an attractively simplified disagreement on Basil's failure to call the Spirit God, arguing rather for its soteriological activity. While Chapter 1 has demonstrated that it is possible to do this, Chapter 3 will also draw on Basil's *Hom*. 15, delivered just before the events of *Ep*. 58, to demonstrate the manner in which Basil's economy on the Spirit was manifested. The chapter is laid out in four parts. The first of these deals with those issues which may have caused friction between Basil and Gregory. The second is concerned with the episcopal orations deliverd by Gregory prior to his open declaration of the Spirit's divinity. The third is concerned with that declaration, the position held by Basil in *Hom*. 15, and the nature of the dispute between them. The fourth and final section considers the final works of the period as an attempt to mediate and pastorally express those positions.

A. Issues at Stake between Basil and Gregory

I. Audience and Tension

Having examined the early development and shape of Gregory's language expressing the interaction of Spirit and salvation, it is now possible to form a better understanding of the critical developments that occurred in the period around his elevation to the episcopacy of Sasima in 372, as well as his subsequent tenure at Nazianzus in 373 and his departure into seclusion in 374. The defining event of the period is not his elevation or his flight, but the apparent

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

breakdown of his relationship with Basil – specifically, the terms in which it occurred and its immediate consequences for Gregory's thought on the Spirit in salvation. This narrow period between 372 and 374 is significant not just for Gregory's thought, but for also for that of Basil. It was in the aftermath of these events that Basil wrote his *DSS*, and it was on Gregory's return to public life in Constantinople that he would publicly declare himself as a defender of the Spirit. However, the significance of this period in bringing about a later focus on the Spirit and salvation, which has been tracked to this point by way of theological grammar, has not received much attention. In an effort to address this, and the limits it places on understanding Gregory's soteriological pneumatology, this chapter will examine how the question of the Spirit's action in salvation became the crux of the dispute between Basil and Gregory. This period of literary tension with his immediate contemporary established Gregory, publicly and theologically, as a defender of the Spirit in fact rather than just in theory, and set the stage for his most productive period in 379, in Constantinople.

Some ground-clearing is necessary before it is possible to approach texts from this period directly. The foremost problem is that Gregory is often regarded as either having had no sustained interest in the Spirit in his career until Constantinople, with a handful of notable exceptions in his episcopal orations, or as having taken direction entirely from Basil on the subject, or, finally, as having been a strident advocate for the divinity of the Spirit in contrast to a silent Basil.[1] All of these positions are somewhat problematic. The first has been demonstrated as false in connection to the language of salvation in the previous chapter. Gregory possessed a broadly articulated interest in the role of the Spirit in salvation even prior to 372. The thinking underlying the first position leads into the second: that Gregory was primarily an adherent of Basil's, from whose theology he did not substantially diverge. This may be valid in retrospect – that is to say, when the entirety of their works are taken together. However, while Basil and Gregory evince numerous similarities, such a position is clearly invalid when considered with reference to works from a specific period. The same problem applies to the position that Gregory did not deviate from Basil's pneumatology. Such a position is flawed with reference to the broad sweep of both men's works, and the lack of consistency in their language or their periods of focus on the Spirit.[2]

The problem with the idea of Gregory writing in principled opposition to Basil's silence on the Spirit is that in 373 Gregory and Basil were arguing in broadly similar terms, if not identical language. A way forward can be seen in

[1] Hanson, *Search*, 818; Beeley, "The Holy Spirit," 91–92.

[2] McGuckin's response in McGuckin, *Gregory*, 216, n. 225 about the past tense and those who "abuse this letter [58] to evidence that Gregory was totally dependent on Basil for this theology" is germane.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

the works of McGuckin, Beeley, and Radde-Gallwitz. McGuckin argues that Gregory, newly elevated to the episcopacy, was determined to "provoke a response" from Basil on the subject of the Spirit in his episcopal orations.[3] Beeley, in line with this position, suggests that Gregory was setting out a "full doctrine of the Trinity," against, presumably, the limited account offered by Basil.[4] In attempting to counter the idea of Basil having a weak doctrine of the Spirit, Radde-Gallwitz argues in favour of Basil having had a fully developed pneumatology, with his only deficiency being a failure to directly ascribe deity to the Spirit.[5] Radde-Gallwitz constructs his position on the basis of a reading of Basil's *Hom*. 15, which he contends is likely the sermon that was related to Gregory in *Ep*. 58, dating from around 373.[6] To some extent, these arguments are all valid – Gregory does directly attribute deity to the Spirit in *Or*. 13, and Basil does present a worked-out pneumatology in *Hom*. 15. Nevertheless, this does not fully appreciate that it was not just the question of deity but the means by which that divinity is experienced that defined Gregory's response in *Ep*. 58. Basil proceeds from the internal relationship of the Trinity to an implicit recognition of the Spirit's divinity and an appreciation of the Spirit's action in the biblical text.[7] By failing to affirm instead that such action insists upon divinity openly in the biblical text, and far more importantly experientially in the life of the believer, Basil would have damaged not just the claims of Gregory's monastic supporters of a fully divine Spirit, but impugned Gregory's earlier claims that those things the Spirit

[3] McGuckin, *St Gregory*, 206.

[4] Beeley, *Knowledge*, 15; *Ep*. 58.

[5] Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea: A Guide to His Life and Doctrine*, Cascade Companions 16 (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2012), 106.

[6] Radde-Gallwitz takes this up the date of 372 the basis of Jean Bernardi, *La prédication des Pères Cappadociens. Le prédicateur et son auditoire* (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de l'Universté Montpellier 30) Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1968), 85–86. The dating offered by Radde-Gallwitz is somewhat problematic, as a dating of *Hom*. 15 to Sept 7, 372, delivered at the feast of St Eupsychius, places it almost a year before Ep. 58's autumn 373 dating. The text of *Ep*. 58 makes it clear that these events occurred relatively quickly. McGuckin, *Gregory*, 214, n. 212 offers an alternative by suggesting 58 and *Or*. 13 are proximate to the feast of St Eupsychius in 373 – Basil's *Hom*. 15 may simply be celebrating Eupsychius in 373, rather than 372. Such a dating makes the relevance of *Hom*. 15 more likely, and can thus only support Radde-Gallwitz's argument, but even an earlier dating has little impact on its relevance as a representative example of Basil's pneumatology prior to *On the Holy Spirit*. On later datings see Michael Haykin, *The Spirit of God: Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 150.

[7] Without suggesting that he agrees with my argument here, Stephen Hildebrand provides an informative perspective on Basil's pneumatology in Stephen Hildebrand, *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea: A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007), 173ff.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

manifests in the believer – harmony, deification, purification, and the empowering of clergy – are divine.[8]

1. Relevance of the Spirit

An examination of the early letters exchanged between Basil and Gregory in this period helps illuminate some of the pneumatological undercurrents running throughout. The most pertinent of these undercurrents, by way of introduction to Gregory's episcopal orations, is the degree to which this period reflects concerns and investments already identified in Gregory's earlier works. McGuckin has written an extensive treatment of this period of Gregory's life that deals with the correspondence with Basil, and illuminates the broader context of Basil's attempts to secure episcopal authority in Caesarea.[9] As the concerns of this project are principally on the theological exchange which ran alongside personal dispute, only a few points of detail will be considered in depth, in order to frame the immediate situation from Gregory's perspective and to demonstrate the ongoing implicit relevance of the Spirit, before turning to those texts in which the ideas suggested at in these letters are more fully worked out.

After Basil's successful bid to succeed Eusebius as archbishop of Caesarea Mazaca, there was a marked deterioration in the relationship between the new bishop and Gregory. One of the principal markers of this is found in correspondence contemporary with the election, in which Basil exhorted Gregory to attend him. Gregory demurred, citing a desire to wait until the resentment around Basil's elevation quietened down as well as his concern for Basil's reputation.[10] McGuckin places these events within the context of betrayed principles and, possibly, wounded pride – he posits that Gregory may have perceived his friend as having violated their apparent agreement not to seek advancement in public life, or that Gregory was vexed that his friend did not consider the possibility of Gregory himself making a claim.[11] Once Basil's succession was confirmed, however, McGuckin concludes that Gregory

[8] The importance of experience is easily overlooked, particularly when Gregory's later works are considered without the context provided by his early episcopacy. Something of this is apparent in Burgess' otherwise excellent summary of Gregory's pneumatology. See Stanley Burgess, *The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian Traditions* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1984), 151–60.

[9] McGuckin, *Gregory*, 169–227.

[10] *Ep*. 45.

[11] McGuckin, *Intellectual Biography*, 172–73. McGuckin makes a strong case, well supported by his interpretation of the relevant texts, but maintains that it is primarily speculative, and has not been substantially developed, noting two "considerations" in Eugène Fialon, *Étude historique et littéraire sur saint Basile suivie de l'Hexaméron* (Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1869), 85–86 and Eugène Fleury, *Saint Héllenisme et christianisme. Saint Grégoire de Naizanze et son temps* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1930), 216.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

turned to his defence, and to convincing Gregory the Elder that Basil represented the best hope of the Nicene cause.[12] While a concern for a Trinitarian theological project is apparent throughout the period, Gregory demonstrates little overt concern for the Spirit until mid-373.[13] Gregory's later orations suggest a far stronger concern for the Spirit in 373 than texts from the period itself would suggest.

A retrospective desire to emphasise the importance of the Spirit in this period is especially apparent in Gregory's funeral oration for Basil from late 381. In that oration, Basil's victory is a victory for the Holy Spirit, and Basil's victory came by the aid of that same Spirit.[14] That Gregory's citation of the Spirit is not just driven by irenicism is affirmed by a reference to his own earlier comments on the Spirit from *Or*. 6, in *Ep*. 45, dating around 373.[15] He wrote of this: "When I learned that you had been placed on the high throne, and that the Spirit carried the day to make public the lamp upon the lampstand, which did not shine dimly before, I was, I admit, pleased."[16] Whatever tone these remarks are intended to strike, they point back towards *Or*. 6.9, and towards the light of the Spirit hid under a bushel until when "in a short while he [the Spirit] will put it on a lampstand to illumine the whole soul of the Church and be a light to our path," and Basil will lead the church to the waters of the Spirit.[17] Calvet-Sebasti maintained that the subject of this sentence is unclear, only offering Basil as an option. When the remarks from *Or*. 6 and *Ep*. 45 are taken together Basil's support of the Spirit certainly seems the likely referent of both.[18] A "short while" proved to be closer to seven years, but these remarks offer an insight into a persistent concern not just for a particular, durable concern on Gregory's part for the role of the Spirit, and Basil's part in establishing it. The evidence supporting a connection between the two passages is substantial. In addition to the use of λυχνία in both cases, something obscured in widely-available English translations,

[12] McGuckin, *Intellectual Biography*, 173.

[13] As part of the consideration mentioned above, Fialon suggests that, "Il [Gregory] comprend que l'élection de Basile est capitale, qu'il faut que le Saint-Esprit triomphe." This is consistent with *Or*. 43, but whether or not it was true at the time is not developed further. See Fialon, *Saint Basile*, 86.

[14] *Or*. 43.37.

[15] McGuckin quotes these lines before offering his reassessment of the tone of the letter, but does not elaborate on them specifically. See McGuckin, *Gregory*, 177.

[16] *Ep*. 45.1. Gallay, *Lettres* 1, 58. Ἐπειδή σε τεθέντα ἐπί τὸν ὑφλὸν θρόνον ἔγνων καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐνίκησε, τὸν λύχνον ἐπὶ τῆς λυχνίας δημοσιεῦσαν, οὐδὲ τὸ πρὶν ἀμυδρῶς λάμποντα, ἥσθην μέν, ὁμολογῶ.

[17] *Or*. 6.9, trans. Vinson, 10. SC 405, 144. ὃν θήσει μετ' ὀλίγον "ἐπὶ τὴν λυχωίαν," πᾶσαν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας φυχὴν περιλάμφοντα, καὶ "φῶς ταῖς τρίβοις" ἡμῶν ἐσόμενον…

[18] SC 405, 16–18, 142–43, n. 1. See also 144, n. l, where Calvet-Sebasti notes the Mt 5:15 reference. Calvet-Sebasti does not connect *Ep*. 45 with *Or*. 6 or Mt 5:15.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

the passages have a biblical text in common in Mt 5:15.[19] The connection is further strengthened by Gregory's addition of the Spirit – absent from that verse and its parallels. In addition, there are relatively few references to the lamp-stand image in Gregory.[20] A short time later, when Gregory's patience began to wear thin, he would draw upon the same image in *Or*. 12.6: "For how long will we hide the lamp under the bushel, and refuse the perfect Godhead to others... [Μέχρι γὰρ τίνος τῷ μοδίῳ τὸν λύχνον περικαλύψομεν, καὶ φθονήσομεν τοῖς ἄλλοις τῆς τελείας θειότητος]..."[21] On this basis, Gregory's repetition of an appeal to Basil's role as the publisher of the Spirit's light between 364 and 373 suggests an ongoing confidence in his friend's public leadership on the question of the Spirit's divinity.[22]

2. Gregory's Commitment to Basil

The durability of Gregory's belief in Basil's commitment to the Spirit renders more explicable the events that would follow in the months after Gregory's elevation to the see of Sasima. McGuckin's arguments concerning the question of offence to personal and familial honour in attaching Gregory to such a remote region are convincing, and do go some way to addressing the vituperative exchanges between Gregory and Basil.[23] However, explanations as to why the deity of the Spirit became so consequential have generally required reading later works into earlier ones. Demonstrating the connection between *Or*. 6.9 and *Ep*. 45.1 allows Gregory's concern for the Spirit's role in salvation to possess an early, critical dimension without the need to appeal to later advances on the subject.

Writing to Basil after he was raised to the episcopacy, Gregory told his friend that, "[f]or our part, we take only this from your friendship: not to trust in friends, that I shall learn not to trust in friends, and to esteem nothing higher than God [Ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦτο μόνον κερδανοῦμεν τῆς σῆς φιλίας,

[19] Alternately, this could refer to Lk 11:33 or Mk 4:21, but not to Lk 8:16 due to the absence of μόδιος from that variant. In this limited context there is no way to decide between them. Mt 5:15 is privileged here, following Calvet-Sebasti.

[20] Further references are found in *Ors*. 2.72, 10.3, 21.31, and *Ep*. 164.1. A similar reference is found in *Or*. 5.35, but this is more plausibly connected to with the "seven-stemmed lamp" of the temple, also referenced in *Or*. 41.4.

[21] *Or*. 12.6. SC 405, 360.

[22] On the position of Basil as the intellectual figurehead of the three Cappadocians see Timothy P. McConnell, *Illumination in Basil of Caesarea's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014), 3, n. 2 in particular. While, as demonstrated above, McConnell is not wrong in his assertion, he may be overstating the depth of confidence held by Gregory of Nazianzus by relying on his funeral oration for Basil.

[23] McGuckin, *Intellectual Biography*, 172–73.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

τὸ μὴ πιστεύειν φίλοις μήτε τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιεῖσθαί τι προτιμότερον]."[24] In the context of the increasing pressure Basil was placing on his friend, and the acerbic tone of the letter in which it appears, this might be read as an exhortation towards a return to simpler values. However, in light of Gregory's ongoing investment in his friend's role in asserting the deity of the Spirit, these remarks appear as an exhortation to advancement, rather than retreat. This reading, de-emphasising individual pride in favour of emphasising how theological priorities were structured between the two would-be leaders of the Nicene camp, sits much more comfortably with the self-edited nature of the correspondence. Gregory's letters were organised into collections for the benefit of his nephew and to help craft the narrative of himself Gregory wished to present.[25] On this basis, an image emerges of Gregory as the early benefactor of the Spirit, nobly standing against his friend's misguided political investments. Such an image is not only congruent with the pneumatological currents and linguistic refinements found in Gregory's early works. Moving forward, it will also reframe Gregory's episcopal orations not as a lashing out of wounded pride, but as a natural development from existing theological investments.

B. Before "God the Spirit"

I. Fear of the Spirit

Gregory's first episcopal orations, delivered between 372 to 373, were given in a variety of locations: 9 in Sasima, 11b at the shrine of St Orestes, and 10, 11a, and 12 occurring at Nazianzus.[26] As McGuckin, Beeley, and others have noted, these orations are characterised by boldness and a desire to outline a theological programme with authority to match that with which Gregory was vested. The consequence of this boldness is that many of the themes identified from Gregory's earlier works are more clearly presented but, as with the introduction of θέωσις in *Or*. 4, these are not the better developed here (for all that they are bold). Despite this, these orations offer a good sense of how

[24] *Ep.* 48.9–10. Gallay, *Lettres* 1, 63.

[25] Although this will be developed further in Chapter 5, especially pertinent to the idea of Gregory's self-representation in text are Neil McLynn, "The Other Olympias: Gregory Nazianzen and the Family of Vitalianus," *Journal of Ancient Christianity* 2, 2 (1998): 227–46; also John McGuckin, "Autobiography as *Apologia* in St. Gregory Nazianzen," StPatr 37 (2001): 160–77.

[26] This represents the order put forward by McGuckin. The specific order is not critical to this study as, other than the suggestion that *Or*. 11 is entirely inauthentic, it is generally accepted that these works represent the thrust of Gregory's thought in the period from 372 to 373.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

the interaction of Spirit and salvation fared in the face of Gregory's new-found authority, and his drive to set out a theological programme to match it.[27]

Although it opens with an affirmation of the Spirit – "Spirit and Chrism upon me [Πάλιν ἐπ' ἐμὲ χρίσμα καὶ Πνεῦμα]!" – *Or*. 9 also contains one of the more interesting re-readings of the biblical story that Gregory undertakes in this mid-period of his career.[28] From 1 Sam 10:6, "And the Spirit of the Lord shall come upon you, and you shall prophesy with them, and be turned into another man," Gregory develops a narrative of the fallibility of deification:

> How are we to understand the example of Saul? He was anointed, received the Spirit, and was thereupon undeniably spiritual, in my opinion. Indeed, he even became a prophet, and so surpassed any reasonable expectation that that miracle in fact gave rise to the proverb that is still repeated to this very day, Is Saul also among the prophets? But inasmuch as he did not surrender himself fully to the Spirit he was also not changed purely into another man, as had been foretold, but retained something of the old spark of wickedness and of the evil seed and was subject to a conflict between spirit and flesh. [...] Consequently, even grace itself, to mention the strangest and worst of our own misfortunes, by implanting delusion and false hopes, frequently creates distance between God and those who have not come to him in the right spirit, and we are cast down when we were lifted up, that sin might be shown to be sin, working death in me through what is good. It is the dread of this misfortune that has filled me with anguish and depression. My experiences somewhat akin to what children feel when they see lightning – a mixture of terror and delight: I have come at the same time to love and to fear the Spirit.[29]

---

[27] See McGuckin, *Gregory*, 192, Beeley, *Knowledge*, 159–60.

[28] *Or*. 9.1. SC 405, 300.

[29] *Or*. 9.2–3, trans. Vinson, 21–22. SC 405, 302–6. Τί ὑπολαμβάνομὲν περὶ τοῦ Σαούλ; Ἐχρίστη μὲν γὰρ καὶ μετέσχε τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ ἦν τότε πνευματικὸς, οὐδ' ἂν ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτοῦ φαίην ἑτέρως, ἀλλὰ καὶ προεφήτευσε, καὶ οὕτω παρ' ἐλπίδα καὶ τὸ εἰκὸς, ὥστε καὶ παροιμίαν γενέσθαι τὸ θαῦμα ἐκεῖνο· "Εἰ καὶ Σαοὺλ ἐν προφήταις;" εἰς ἔτι καὶ νῦν λεγόμενόν τε καὶ ἀκουόμενον. Ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐχ ὅλον ἑαυτὸν ἐμπαρέσχε τῷ πνεύματι, οὐδὲ ἐστράφη καθαρῶς εἰς ἄνδρα ἄλλον, ὡς κεχρημάτιστο, ἀλλ' ἐνέμεινέ τι τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῆς κακίας σπινθῆρος καὶ τοῦ Πονηροῦ σπέρματος, καὶ ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ μάχη πνεύματος καὶ σαρκός· […] Πλὴν ἐκεῖνο κἀντεῦθεν γνώριμον ὅτι, κἂν μὴ τῶν ἀναξίων ἡ χάρις ἅπτηται, μηδὲ πονηροῦ καὶ ἀναρμόστου παντελῶς τοῦ ὀργάνου – "εἰς γὰρ κακότεχνον ψυχὴν μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι σοφίαν" εἴ ρηται καλῶς, κἀγὼ πείθομαι –, ἀλλὰ φυλάξαι γε τὴν ἀξίαν καὶ τὴν ἁρμονίαν, ὡς ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος, ἔργον οὐκ ἔλαττον, ἢ ἀπαρχῆς ἁρμοσθῆναι καλῶς καὶ ἀξιωθῆναι, διὰ τὸ τρεπτὸν καὶ ἀλλοιωτὸν τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἕξεώς τε καὶ φύσεως· ᾧ γε καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτὴ πολλάκις – ἵν' εἴπω τῶν ἡμετέρων κακῶν τὸ σχετλιώτατόν τε καὶ παραδοξότατον –, τύφον ἐμποιήσασα καὶ μετεωρίσασα, κατήνεγκεν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ τοὺς οὐ καλῶς προσεγγίσαντας, καὶ κατεβλήθημεν "ἐν τῷ ἐπαρθῆναι," "ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία, διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον." Ταῦτά ἐστιν, ἃ ἐγὼ δεδοικὼς, πικρίας ἐνεπλήσθην καὶ κατηφείας, καί τι τοιοῦτον ἔπαθον οἷον πρὸς

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Gregory's re-telling of Saul's "example" does not deviate from the Septuagintal text in many respects. However, he is principally interested in drawing out the role of the Spirit, to the extent that Gregory passes over the various "calamities" that befall Saul – including his influence by an "evil spirit" – in favour of amalgamating and re-interpreting these as evidence of an incomplete abandonment of the fleshly for the things of the Spirit. This reflection on the action of the Spirit continues through a recitation of that which the Spirit does for believers through the priesthood, touching on a variety of now-familiar themes: elevating, guarding, and guiding to the Spirit. Compared with Gregory's earlier works, nothing of what he has to say concerning the action of the Spirit in salvation here is new. Gregory's vacillation between fear and love for the Spirit, articulated in these exact terms for the first (but not last) time here, is integral to the function of suffering in his early thinking. The misfortune described through allusion to Saul, of not possessing the right spirit and consequently being cast down, occurs as part of the process of salvation. The Spirit brings this about "that sin might be shown to be sin, working death in me through what is good."[30] These events are precipitated by a failing in the believer, such as Saul, Gregory, or the implicit referent, Basil, which was rectified by their misfortune.[31]

This interpretation is not compromised by the "working of death." Such language had not been used before, but seems to foreshadow Gregory's thinking on death as a cure for sin. So, while this is not new thinking, it is here expressed in a way that foreshadows many of the conceptual developments not yet encountered. Having spent fully half of this oration on this subject of the catastrophic effects of grace received in sin, and how Gregory must collect himself from just such a misfortune to exercise his pastoral responsibilities, he spends the remainder speaking directly to Basil. The tone is wounded, rather than vituperative, and does not make reference to the first half of his sermon. Rather than a cohesive programme, this represents the sweep of concerns with which he was faced, and which all impinged on one another. Just such a concern is suggested in his doxology that appeals to "Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom glory be to the almighty Father, together with the holy Spirit both now and forever and ever."[32] While it would as yet be

τὰς ἀστραπὰς οἱ παῖδες, ἡδονὴν ἐκπλήξει μι γνύντες ἐκ τοῦ θεάματος· ἠγάπησά τε ὁμοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐφοβήθην·

[30] *Or*. 9.2, trans. Vinson, 22.

[31] As Mantzaridis writes, "[m]oral purity does not of course suffice to elevate the human person to the level of the authentic knowledge of God." Georgios Mantzaridis, "Self-Knowledge and Knowledge of God According to St Gregory the Theologian," *Phronema* 26, no. 2 (2011): 18.

[32] *Or*. 9.6, trans. Vinson, 25. SC 405, 314. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ ἡ δόξα Πατρὶ παντοκράτορι σὺν τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἀγαθῷ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

some time before Gregory openly affirmed the deity of the Spirit, his thinking certainly trended towards affirming equality. At this point, the Spirit shares *glory* only ambiguously at best.

II. Bonds of the Spirit

Gregory's subsequent *Or*. 11, which can be divided into two distinct parts, is notably less consistent in its interest in the Spirit. *Or*. 11b, which was delivered first, contains no mentions of the Spirit either in the oration's body or in its doxology. On the contrary, *Or*. 11a demonstrates a concern for the Spirit.[33] The interlacing of a concern for Basil's actions and Basil's role as chief of their faction pulling for the Spirit manifests quite strongly in *Or*. 11a:

> Of these men one anointed us, bringing us out of hiding into the world. I know not what incident or impulse motivated him to act so unworthily of the Spirit within him (my words are admittedly somewhat harsh, but I will say them nevertheless: friendship is a patient listener and will accept all things). The other has come to commiserate with me and to restore harmony by reconciling us to the Spirit...[34]

Addressed to Gregory of Nyssa, these lines suggest a number of readings. While the most obvious is one which Gregory already expressed in *Or*. 6: the Spirit as harmoniser, and the discord between Gregory and Basil as contrary to the Spirit. When placed within the frame of an on-going dispute over explicitly associating the deifying action of the Spirit with divinity, it forms another point in the dispute with Basil. An interpretation in that direction could be supported by the various mentions throughout this oration concerning the action of the Spirit. The most notable of these appeals to language which is still quite new: "an opportunity for transactions and trade, instead of ascent, or if I may be so bold, deification [καὶ πραγματειῶν καιροὺς καὶ πραγμάτων, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀναβάσεως ἢ θεώσεως]."[35] The implication that such a meeting should have been an opportunity for a sharing in the Spirit and an elevation of those present but which, instead, has been reduced to a

---

[33] *Or*. 11.2 A raft of allusions support this section: Ex. 7:1, Ps 99:6, Ex 17:8–13, Heb 8:2, Ex 4:16.

[34] *Or*. 11.3, trans. Vinson, 31. SC 405, 332. Τούτων ὁ μὲν ἔχρισεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ κρυπτομένους εἰς μέσον ἤγαγεν, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι παθὼν, ἢ πῶς κινηθεὶς ἀναξίως τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ Πνεύματος. Καὶ γὰρ εἰ τραχύτερος ὁ λόγος, ὅμως εἰρήσεται· πάντα οἴσει φιλία καὶ πάσχουσα καὶ ἀκούουσα. Ὁ δὲ παρακαλέσων ἥκει, καὶ συμβιβάσων, καὶ προσημερώσων τῷ Πνεύματι.

[35] *Or*. 11.5, trans. Vinson, 33–34. SC 405, 340. Susan R. Holman, "Healing the Social Leper in Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus 'περὶ φιλοπτωχίας'," *Harvard Theological Review* 92, no. 3 (1999): 283–309, 306–9 particularly on conceptual overlap that might have made this exchange more significant. If Holman is correct, a shared investment in the importance of physical contact and holiness may have made this sort of meeting significant.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

kind of marketplace is suggestive. Likewise, a concern for purity and purification runs throughout the oration, as does a desire to oppose the enemies of the Spirit.[36] At the same time, the absence of the Spirit from the doxology of *Or*. 11b might suggest that this was not a principal concern at the delivery of that oration. However, the dating and composition of *Or*. 11 as a whole is disputable. Connections between 11a and 11b are tenuous and predicated on the texts having been compiled together by someone, whether by Gregory or an unknown amanuensis, on the basis of some unknown criterion. With this in mind, it is unwise to rely on *Or*. 11 an attempt to identify the theological or conceptual forces at work in the period. Indeed, the relative paucity of Spirit language in *Or*. 11b makes a strong case for a much later, in that the question of the Spirit's importance to the neo-Nicene movement had already been settled. On this basis, it is possible to move on to the remainder of Gregory's episcopal orations with a discussion that is aware of, but not too heavily influenced by, *Or*. 11.

The question of the Spirit is demonstrably unsettled in *Or*. 10, whose doxology contains another case in which Gregory re-casts a New Testament reference to faith to refer to the Spirit. Rom 5:1–2 reads: "Therefore, since we have been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Through him we have also obtained access by faith into this grace in which we stand, and we boast in hope of the glory of God."[37] Gregory adapted this in *Or*. 10.4: "Jesus Christ, through whom we have received our reconciliation; and the Holy Spirit, which has charged us with this ministry in which we now take our place, boasting in the hope of sharing the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ..."[38] Although Gregory maintained parallels with 5:2, there are a few paraphrases – in the last case, "God" has been replaced with "Christ." As Gregory refers to Christ as Θεὸς καὶ Κύριος immediately before this, the change is the second part of a straightforward reinforcement of Christ's divinity.

Beyond this, the first half of 10.4 substitutes grace for reconciliation, itself drawn from Rom 5:11. The replacement of faith with the Spirit in Gregory's paraphrase is somewhat different in character. Unlike the blunt substitutions used before, this is a more dynamic change in emphasis from faith as the motivating factor within the community to an explicit identification of the agent through whom faith is mediated. In Rom 5:2, faith grants access to

[36] *Ors*. 11.4; 11.6.

[37] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι᾽ οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν τῇ πίστει εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ ἑστήκαμεν, καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ. SBLGNT, 319.

[38] *Or*. 10.4, trans. Vinson, 29. SC 405, 326. Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δί᾽ οὗ τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ ἔθετο ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἑστήκαμεν καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ… There are suggestions of 2 Cor 5:18–21 as well.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

grace "in which we now stand." In *Or*. 10.4, the Spirit has placed Gregory in his post, acting as expositor of a faith which is not just coherent but identical with the Trinity. A gatekeeper role is occupied by faith in the former and the Spirit in the latter. In either case, sharing in the glory of God or Christ-as-God is a subsequent cause for boasting. This is both an echo and an intimation – it recalls the earlier cases of Gregory substituting faith for the Spirit, and it points towards later references in Gregory's work where the Spirit's instantiation of sharing in Christ is a significant theme.[39]

An acknowledgement of this transfer between the Trinity, its members, and the concept of faith is hardly unknown in scholarship on Gregory. Beeley amplifies the idea somewhat, positing that for Gregory "...the knowledge of the Trinity [is] the faith, rebirth, deification, and hope of Christians."[40] Such a strong statement is appropriate to a retrospective take on Gregory's theology, and Beeley supports his claim with reference to orations composed during Gregory's residence in Constantinople. In the context of *Or*. 10, and the concurrent emphasis specifically on the relationship between Gregory and the Spirit, a narrower response to the question of the constitution of faith is credible. In this case, rather than knowledge of the Trinity encompassing "faith, rebirth, deification, and hope," the faith and the Spirit are equated, with the Spirit having put Gregory in the position not of grace, but of expositing the faith and the Spirit.

This doxology and its concern for the Spirit characterises the oration as a whole. Gregory was bound in the "indissoluble bonds of the Spirit"; his expressed desire for quiet learning is a communing between "myself [Gregory] and the Spirit [ἐμαυτῷ δὲ προσλαλῶν καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι]."[41] Upon reflecting on the hands that forced him into the episcopacy he laughed 'in the Spirit', and considered his friendship with Basil as having "started in the world and advanced to the spirit [ἀρξαμένης ἀπὸ κόσμου, καὶ προελθούσης εἰς πνεῦμα]."[42] In explaining his feelings concerning his friendship with Basil after being elevated, Gregory appealed repeatedly to the Spirit and makes another reference to Mt 5:15, recalling *Or* 6.9 and *Ep*. 45. Gregory referenced the lamp and the bushel found in those other texts, but here ascribes the reference to Basil, making reference to Gregory's work.[43] In the context established earlier with reference to Gregory's use of Mt 5:15 and his support for Basil's role as the standard-bearer of the supporters of a divine Spirit, these remarks are especially consequential.[44]

[39] *Or*. 40 in particular.

[40] Beeley, *Knowledge*, 231.

[41] *Or*. 10.1, trans. Vinson, 26. SC 405, 316.

[42] *Or*. 10.2, trans. Vinson, 27. SC 405, 320.

[43] *Or*. 10.3.

[44] While Gregory's allusive approach to scripture is often suggestive, the significance of individual references can sometimes be lost. It is important to keep in sight that reception

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

If Gregory's "work" is at least entailing a defense of the divinity of the Spirit, a reasonable position in light of the references preceding it, this small oration represents a shift in how Gregory perceived his relationship with Basil. While it would be overstating the case to suggest that this represents a shift in the leadership of the pro-Nicene group from Basil to Gregory, it does suggest that Gregory re-conceived Basil's betrayal of their friendship – as well as the consequent offence against the Spirit of the resulting disharmony – as undertaken in support of affirming the Spirit.

III. Teachings of the Spirit

This reading, suggesting a new-found sense of drive to defend the Spirit, adds some weight to McGuckin's dating of *Or*. 10 to immediately prior to *Or*. 12 in early 373. It also goes some way towards explaining Gregory's open declaration of divinity of the Spirit in *Or*. 13. Two principal images of the Spirit's action in salvation are found in *Or*. 12.4:

> The one proposes escapes, mountains, and deserts, and peace, of still soul and body, and that the intellect should withdraw into itself, and rally away from sensation so as to have a spotless relation to God, and be brilliantly illumined by the rays of the Spirit, with no admixture or disturbance of passions diverting the divine light, until we come to the fount of the radiance which we enjoy here, and we shed regret and desire, the mirrors refuted by the truth.[45]

> Even so it was for Christ, who had the opportunity to stay in his own honour and his own divinity, not only emptied himself so far as to take the form of a slave, but submitted to the cross, disdaining the shame, that by his own sufferings he might destroy sin, and by death kill death. The former [retreat] are the imaginings of desire, the latter the teachings of the Spirit. Caught between desire and the Spirit, and not knowing which to indulge, I will tell you what I found fair and secure, so that you may examine it with me, and aid my plan.[46]

---

of Gregory regarded this "contextual" approach highly. Margaret Beirne, "Scripture in the Works of St Gregory the Theologian," *Phronema* 26, 2 (2011): 57.

[45] *Or*. 12.4. SC 405, 354. Ὁ μὲν εἰσηγεῖται δρασμοὺς καὶ ὄρη, καὶ ἐρημίας, καὶ ἡσυχίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος καὶ τὸν νοῦν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναχωρῆσαι, καὶ συστραφῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσθήσεων, ὥστε ὁμιλεῖν ἀκηλιδώτως Θεῷ, καὶ ταῖς Πνεύματος αὐγαῖς καθαρῶς ἐναστράπτεσθαι, μηδενὸς ἐπιμιγνυμένου τῶν κάτω καὶ θολερῶν, μηδὲ τῷ θείῳ φωτὶ παρεμπίπτοντος, ἕως ἂν ἐπὶ τὴν πηγὴν ἔλθωμεν τῶν τῇδε ἀπαυγασμάτων, καὶ στῶμεν τοῦ πόθου καὶ τῆς ἐφέσεως λυθέντων τῶν ἐσόπτρων τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

[46] Ibid. SC 405, 356. Ἐπεὶ καὶ Χριστὸς οὕτως, ᾧ μένειν ἐξὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας τιμῆς καὶ θεότητος, οὐ μόνον ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν μέχρι τῆς τοῦ δούλου μορφῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ σταυρὸν ὑπέμεινεν αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας, ἵν' ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πάθεσιν ἀναλώσῃ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ ἀποκτείνῃ τῷ θανάτῳ τὸν θάνατον. Ἐκεῖνα μὲν δὴ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τὰ πλάσματα, ταῦτα δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος τὰ διδάγματα. Μέσος δὲ ὢν πόθου καὶ Πνεύματος, καὶ οὐκ ἔχων τίνι τὸ πλέον χαρίσομαι, ὅ μοι δοκῶ

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

To be so torn between duty and selfishness (or the Spirit and desire) itself being a qualifier for the duty was by this point a well-worn cultural trope, and this particular instance should not be seen as an indication of actual uncertainty.[47] Gregory's deconstruction of the binary is the point of the passage.

In these two passages from *Or.* 12.4, it is clear to the point of prefiguring the most mature of his own thinking that salvation is not located as a process undertaken by Christ, external to the believer, but as natural to the Spirit. As alluded to in the earlier reference to Rom 5:2, Christ grants access to reconciliation, but the believer's access to Christ is granted in turn by the Spirit (rather than faith, as in the text of Rom 5:2). This idea, rendered as the "teachings of the Spirit," is a critical formulation for how the various categories articulated by Gregory in his earliest works were being drawn together to be expressed as a coherent theology in the period between 372 to 374.

While the function of these teachings is to introduce the believer into the events of Christ's birth, death, and resurrection, events which actualised the possibility of reconciliation (or salvation, whose various literal-metaphorical expressions are themselves informative), it is not possible, in the formulation found here, to distinguish between the "teachings of the Spirit [τοῦ Πνεύματος τὰ διδάγματα]" and the Spirit itself as expressed in the desire for pure communion. On the other hand, the object of Gregory's desire is also salvation, here expressed as an illumination that purifies to the point of admitting no disturbance of the divinity already present in the subject. It stretches out over life to encompass all good, all duty. It seems to offer a counter-point to the "teachings of the Spirit," the event of Christ's sufferings that destroyed sin, and by which the sin of the believer is obviated by the action of the Spirit in their lives, through their suffering (as alluded to in *Or.* 9), and through their imitation of the incarnate Christ.[48]

This dichotomy recalls the organising axiom of most inquiry into Gregory's pneumatology: Christ perfects generally, the Spirit individually. However, closer reading of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology suggests that while broadly valid this is not entirely accurate. In the initial sketch Gregory presents in *Or.* 12.4, the teachings of the Spirit refers to a Christ-like sense of

---

κάλλιστον εὑρηκέναι καὶ ἀσφαλέστατον, κοινώσομαι καὶ ὑμῖν, ἵνα μοι συνδοκιμάσητε καὶ συλλάβησθε τοῦ βουλεύματος.

[47] On the social practicalities of Gregory's self-representation see Susanna Elm, "Gregory's Women: Creating a Philosopher's Family," in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (ed. Jostein Børtnes et al; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006), 178. In particular, Elm's rejection of "thinly disguised attempts at psychology."

[48] On the personal-soteriological paradigm in Gregory's understanding of the incarnation see Hofer, *Mimesis*, 147–51. For a thorough discussion of the relation between Gregory's Christology and suffering see also Gregory Telepneff, "Theopaschite Language in the Soteriology of Saint Gregory the Theologian," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 32, no. 4 (1987): 408.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

duty to the church in which Gregory teaches of the Spirit with the Spirit's guidance, whereas desire refers to a reclusive state in which the greatest part of the purification offered in the Spirit could be experienced personally. In accepting but choosing to bypass both of these propositions, Gregory claimed to chart a course between desire and fear, writing that "after this I will offer my wing to the Spirit to bear as he wills, and where he wills. No one will constrain me, or lead me elsewhere, against his counsel [μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο δώσω τῷ Πνεύματι τὴν ἐμὴν πτέρυγα φέρειν ᾗ βούλεται, καὶ ὡς βούλεται· καὶ οὐδεὶς ὁ βιασόμενος, οὐδὲ ἀπάξων ἑτέρωθι, μετὰ τούτου βουλευόμενον]."[49]

While some distinction can be drawn between what appear to be three relatively similar propositions by referring to the context – Gregory's justification of his decision to serve as an assisting bishop under his father at Nazianzus – each of these models seem to be presented as equally valid. His desire was for a closer, fuller communion with the Spirit in solitude – implying an ascetic practice of which Gregory has written positively, albeit with a degree of reserve.[50] His third way, then, recalls his comments from *Or*. 2 concerning a third way between ascetic withdrawal and public life. By this point, however, that proposition had shifted to one in which all options are framed by the action of the Spirit in possible salvations for the believer. Contrary to some forms of the axiom, he presents the Spirit perfecting communally, individually, and, in his third way, as willing Gregory to a little of both – partaking of deep reflection on the Spirit, but as a matter of necessity, and guided entirely by the Spirit. The Spirit as presented here cannot be said to drive merely towards contemplation: the one who must work with it to elevate his congregation cannot be solely concerned with his own salvation. Instead, the Spirit drives all towards a θέωσις which, ontologically altering the believer, expands the individual into the communal, in imitation of the Trinity.

In addition to demonstrating the sublimation of broader patterns in Gregory's thinking into a frame determined by the Spirit, the close of *Or*. 12 also contains a repetition of the Matt 5:15 reference which informed the starting point of this chapter. Once again, Gregory connected the light to the Spirit, and offered his clearest statement of the divinity of the Spirit to this point, though one which is not without its ambiguities. He began by saying that the Spirit guides their affairs, and continued:

> [f]or our discourse comes back to the same point – to whom we have given ourselves, and the head anointed with the oil of perfection, in the Almighty Father, and the only-begotten Son, and the Holy Spirit, and God. For how long will we hide the lamp under the bushel, and refuse the perfect Godhead to others, when it should be put on the lampstand, and give

[49] *Or*. 12.5. SC 405, 358.
[50] *Eps*. 1, 2.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

light to all the churches, and the souls, and the whole economy, no longer by means of resemblences, or intellectual sketches, but by distinct declaration?[51]

Gregory identifies few key points in this short passage: that this third way he has chosen is guided by the Spirit; that he regards this as a return to his initial comments about desire for seclusion with the Spirit and the teachings of the Spirit; and, most significantly, he offers a reference to the Spirit as God, reinforced by this further reference to Mt 5:15. This is often highlighted as the definitive point at which Gregory declares the divinity of the Spirit, a reading which depends on the translation of τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ Θεῷ as "the Holy Spirit, who is God," or some close variant.[52] While this is certainly a valid reading, it does not account for the ambiguity of the Greek, and that it was spoken to a necessarily friendly congregation, which in turn renders Gregory's question more comprehensible.

If a listener was inclined to hear it as an affirmation, they would, but the dissembling Gregory deplored was still present.[53] As such, *Or*. 13.4 seems somewhat more certain as a point of open declaration – but as with *Or*. 11.6, *Or*. 12.6 is certainly an amplification and affirmation of the Spirit's divinity. Regardless of its significance at the time, *Or*. 12.6 points towards the robustness of the conclusions suggested by Radde-Gallwitz: that Basil did not have an underdeveloped pneumatology against which Gregory reacted.[54] The "intellectual sketch" or "intellectual outline" against which Gregory inveighed is not necessarily prejorative, but here must be understood in tension with "resemblances" and "distinct declaration."[55] Such a sketch or resemblance is

[51] *Or*. 12.6. SC 405, 360. πάλιν γὰρ εἰς ταὐτὸν ὁ λόγος ἀνέρχεται –, ᾧ δεδώκαμεν ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, καὶ τὴν χρισθεῖσαν κεφαλὴν τῷ ἐλαίῳ τῆς τελειώσεως ἐν Πατρὶ παντοκράτορι, καὶ τῷ μονογενεῖ Λόγῳ, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ Θεῷ. Μέχρι γὰρ τίνος τῷ μοδίῳ τὸν λύχνον περικαλύψομεν, καὶ φθονήσομεν τοῖς ἄλλοις τῆς τελείας θειότητος, δέον ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν ἤδη τιθέναι καὶ λάμπειν πάσαις ἐκκλησίαις τε καὶ ψυχαῖς, καὶ παντὶ τῷ τῆς οἰκουμένης πληρώματι, μηκέτι εἰκαζόμενον, μηδὲ τῇ διανοίᾳ σκιαγραφούμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ φανερῶς ἐκλαλούμενον;

[52] Calvet-Sebasti, McGuckin, and Beeley, for example, all use this translation. SC 405, 361; McGuckin, *Gregory*, 206; *NPNF* 7, 248. Beeley, *Knowledge*, 159; 159, n. 21. Beeley, however, mistakes Θεῷ for Θεόν, and as such connects it with declarations in *Ors*. 33.16 and 31.28 which parallel *Or*. 13.4, but not *Or*. 12.6.

[53] There is also a reference by a hostile questioner to Gregory's quotation of Mt 5:15 here in the later *Ep*. 58 which is suggestive, but ambiguous. The questioner states that Gregory speaks openly of God, then refers to the quotation. It does not necessarily connect the two events, but merely suggests hypocrisy on Gregory's part. The text is examined in 3.3.3.

[54] Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil,* 106–8.

[55] Narkevics picks up on the use of outlining in the *Theological Orations* as part of a hermeneutical task and a movement towards truth. As he puts it, "The outline of God's being – *skiagraphia* – refers to the source that inspired the authors of scripture." While

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

best seen as an intellectual exercise that results in assent to the divinity of the Spirit, just as resemblances might be acknowledging biblical figures who possessed the Spirit. In each case, the right result is reached, but without acknowledging, or declaring, the experience of a divine Spirit by believers. As will become apparent, Gregory was concerned that a failure to combine demonstrations with the divinity of the Spirit – its action in the salvation of the believer – with an affirmation of that divinity was degrading both positions. Simply put, Gregory became concerned that an overemphasis on a "Trinitarian-dogmatic" rather than economic, which is to say soteriological, view of the Spirit's divinity compromised both.[56]

IV. Unyielding Spirit

After Gregory's initial episcopal orations, he returned to Nazianzus in order to support his ailing father in the autumn of 373. The two orations from this period are conditioned more by tragic and perilous circumstances than the driven sense of mission found in the episcopal orations.[57] It comes as little surprise that, except for a handful of references, these works are less concerned with court controversy. Despite this, *Ors*. 16 and 17 have a fair amount to say concerning salvation. Although Gregory is principally concerned to reassure his congregation, in *Or*. 16, that God is not punishing them for their transgressions but as an aid to their salvation, he seeks to emphasise the purificatory nature of that suffering. He explains that it is not a punishment for wrong, since to do no wrong belongs to "God alone [μόνου Θεοῦ]," and that it is the believer's repentance that defines humanity moving towards salvation.[58] Demonstrating that this change from bold theology to pastoral reassurance does not entail an abandonment of the programme laid out in his earlier episcopal orations, he wrote that God "inclines from severity towards ease to those who accept discipline with fear, and who out of trivial oppression conceive and suffer the pangs with conversion, and bring the perfect spirit of salvation into the world [κλίνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀποτόμου πρὸς τὸ ἐνδόσιμον τοῖς φόβῳ παιδευομένοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τῆς μικρᾶς θλίψεως

only tangentially related to the concerns of the present chapter this sheds valuable light on the function of outlines, or sketches, in a broader context. See Narkevics, "*Skiagraphia*," 112.

[56] This particular phrasing has been adopted from Scully, who writes of Hilary of Poitiers, "scholarship has judged Hilary's theology of the Holy Spirit to be confusing and inconsistent because it has wrongly approached Hilary's presentation of the Holy Spirit from the dogmatic-Trintarian point of view. When approached economically, Hilary's theology of the Spirit is consistent and nuanced." See Ellen Scully, *Physicalist Soteriology of Hilary of Potiers*, *VCSup* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 239, n. 65.

[57] McGuckin, *St Gregory*, 207.

[58] *Or*. 16.15. *PG* 35, 936.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

συλλαμβάνουσι καὶ ὠδίνουσιν ἐπιστροφὴν, καὶ πνεῦμα σωτηρίας τέλειον ἀποτίκτουσιν]."[59]

This spirit of salvation recalls the image of the improper spirit in which Saul approached his transformation by the Spirit, as described by Gregory in *Or*. 9.2. The language throughout this line is intended to evoke images of child-birth. While easily overlooked, this paralleling of conversion with conception, pregnancy, and birth is striking. Birth, for Gregory a result of indulgence in passion, is recast as a kind of purification. At the same time, it retains the implications of pain, and of distress, involved. A similarly evocative framing of the oration in the context of Spirit-inspiration is also found, as in *Or*. 16.1, where Gregory wrote, "the other [speech] travels into the mind, and opens wide its mouth, fills it with the Spirit, and shown to be greater than its origin, husbands much in a few syllabes."[60] The use of ἐγεώργησε prefigures *Or*. 16.4, this time suggesting the Spirit as drawing forth much from little stock. Many of the implications of birth remain. Suffering as necessary for purification, illumination, glorification, which is to say, salvation, remains the defining characteristic of this oration.[61]

Mark what I have to say: the law of Christ puts you under my jurisdiction and authority, for we too are rulers ourselves; and, I might add, our rule is of a more important and perfect nature; else the Spirit must yield to the flesh and the things of heaven to the things of earth. You will, I know, accept the candour of my observations because you are a sheep in my flock, a holy sheep in a holy flock, a nursling of the great shepherd, guided aright from above by the Spirit, and basking in the same light of the holy and blessed Trinity that we do.[62]

The Spirit both guides the members of Gregory's congregation, and reinforces their more perfect "rule." Gregory expands on this throughout the oration, developing a rhetorical image of the congregation as rulers who possess the image of God, and from Christ the means to reclaim and defend that image against evil and the world. The means by which this is undertaken were again framed with reference to the Spirit when Gregory wrote that, "You can be-

[59] *Or*. 16.4. *PG* 35, 940A.

[60] *Or*. 16.1. *PG* 35, 934B. Ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸν νοῦν δι' έβη καὶ πλατύνας τὸ στόμα ἐπλήρωσε Πνεύματος, καὶ τῆς γεννήσεως ὤφθη μακρότερος, καὶ πολλὰ ἐν ὀλίγαις συλλαβαῖς ἐγεώργησε…

[61] See *Or*. 16.2; 16.8; 16.11.

[62] *Or*. 17.8, trans. Vinson, 91. *PG* 35, 976A–B. Ἆρα δέξεσθε σὺν παῤῥησίᾳ τὸν λόγον; Καὶ ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ νόμος ὑποτίθησιν ὑμᾶς τῇ ἐμῇ δυναστείᾳ καὶ τῷ ἐμῷ βήματι. Ἄρχο μεν γὰρ καὶ αὐτοί· προσθήσω δὲ, ὅτι καὶ τὴν μείζονα καὶ τελεωτέραν ἀρχήν· ἣ δεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑποχω ρῆσαι τῇ σαρκὶ, καὶ τοῖς γηίνοις τὰ ἐπουράνια. Δέξῃ τὴν παῤῥησίαν, οἶδ', ὅτι πρόβατον εἶ τῆς ἐμῆς ποίμνης, τῆς ἱερᾶς ἱερὸν, καὶ θρέμμα τοῦ με γάλου Ποιμένος, καὶ καλῶς ἄνωθεν ἠγμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ τῷ φωτὶ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μακαρίας Τριάδος ὁμοίως ἡμῖν ἐλλαμπόμενον.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

come God without hardship; do not forgo the opportunity for deification. Some men exhaust their coffers, others their bodies for the Spirit and are mortified in Christ and withdraw completely from the world..."[63] Although they hardly seem to be without any hardship, what Gregory implies is not that doing good is without suffering, but that all good actions, mediated by the Spirit and in imitation of Christ, contribute to the salvation of believers.[64] For the purposes of understanding how the role of the Spirit functioned within Gregory's soteriology, and how it influenced the period, these references show a more holistic integration into his broader pastoral work. At the same time, though marked by moderation rather than by the boldness found in those earlier works, these orations point towards the tensions that would eventually cause Gregory to withdraw from the community at Nazianzus in only a few short years. The precipitating factor in the breakdown of his relationship with Basil, however, is to be found in Gregory's *Or*. 13, also delivered in autumn 373.

C. A Divine Spirit

I. Declaring the Spirit God

Such bold affirmations of the power of the Spirit, coming on the heels of a public affirmation that Basil regarded Gregory's mission as sufficient cause to forcibly elevate him to the episcopacy, makes Gregory's words in the doxology of *Or*. 13 more explicable. While the oration itself is relatively unconcerned with discussing the action of the Spirit – with the exception of the Spirit as entrusting a congregation to the bishop at whose elevation Gregory was speaking, in *Or*. 13.4 – its doxology openly affirms the divinity of the Spirit in a manner stronger than in *Or*. 12.6, and to a congregation outside of Nazianzus: "Help us learn to worship God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit as three in their individual realities, one being, glory, and splendour. We ask you to become distinguished in affairs of the Spirit to the same degree that we already know you to be in affairs of the world."[65] It is

[63] *Or*. 17.9–10, trans. Vinson, 92. *PG* 35, 976D–7A. Ἔξεστί σοι Θεὸν γενέσθαι μηδὲν πονήσαντι· μὴ πρόῃ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς θεώσεως. Ἄλλοι χρήματα κενοῦσιν, ἄλλοι σάρκας τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ νεκροῦνται Χριστῷ, καὶ κόσμου παντελῶς ἀπανίστανται·

[64] Wessel offers an interesting assessment of Gregory's appropriation of the leper as Christ metaphor, and an attendant assessment of Christ's suffering. See Susan Wessel, "The Suffering of Christ, humanity, and the lepers in Gregory Nazianzen," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 58:4 (2015): 384.

[65] *Or*. 13.4, trans. Vinson, 34. *PG* 35, 856B–C. Δίδασκε προσκυνεῖν Θεὸν τὸν Πατέρα, Θεὸν τὸν Υἱὸν, Θεὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν, ἐν μιᾷ

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

significant more for its rhetorical force than for the theological content which surrounds it. However, when it is taken together with the content of Gregory's earlier episcopal orations, particularly *Or*. 12, and his earlier works, the theme of a salvific process that operates through the direct intervention of the Spirit (similar to that which Gregory would specifically develop in *Ors*. 31 and 41) becomes apparent. Throughout his early orations, Gregory had appealed to the actions of the Spirit in the salvation of individual believers. In order to express this, he drew on language that was shared with earlier authors – such as the language of θεοποίησις. At the same time, he introduced new images and language, such as that of the actions of the Spirit in the harmonising and deification of believers, in order to express a pneumatology in which the action of the Spirit was not merely integral to salvation. Instead, it is apparent that Gregory's idea of salvation was suffused with a Spirit that also encompassed nearly every aspect of a believer's life and went beyond merely an abstract understanding and assent to the divinity of that Spirit.

Despite this, he had never affirmed the divinity of the Spirit before delivering *Ors*. 12 and 13. Before assessing the consequences of this identification of the Spirit as God for Gregory's relationship with Basil, and how this impacted them both, it is worthwhile to assess Basil's own propositions from the period. By taking these together, it is possible to get a more complete picture of how Gregory understood the experience of the Spirit in salvation, and of how the development of this pneumatology was formed by this critical period of his life.

II. Basil on the Spirit

Basil's *Hom*. 15 was delivered directly into the milieu to which Gregory's episcopal orations and his earlier letters alluded. Those who rejected the divinity of the Spirit were present not merely in the community, but were present at all levels of its leadership, and their support or acquiescence was necessary for Basil's challenge against those who rejected the divinity of the Son to have any weight of authority. Although it is clear from the reading of Gregory's *Ors*. 10 and 12 that Basil had persuaded Gregory to accept elevation to the episcopacy in order to cease "hiding his light" and fulfil his mission of defending the divinity of the Spirit, *Hom*. 15 makes it clear that Basil did not lack a conception of the Spirit himself and was equipped to present it. Fully half of the homily is taken up by a robust and exhaustive consideration of the economic action of the Spirit, delivered with clarity of thought and

---

δόξῃ τε καὶ λαμπρότητι. Τὸ ἀπολωλὸς ἐκζήτει· τὸ ἀσθενὲς ἐνίσχυε· τὸ ἰσχυρὸν φύλασσε. Τοσαύτην ἀπαιτοῦμέν σε τὴν ἐν τοῖς πνευματικοῖς εὐδοκίμησιν, ὅσην ἐπὶ τῶν οσμικῶν συνέγνωμεν. Beeley's comments concerning parallels with *Ors*. 31.28 and 33.16 are germane with reference to *Or*. 13.4. The formulae present in those orations are very close. See Beeley, *Knowledge*, 159.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

detail not seen in Gregory by 373. While Radde-Gallwitz has offered an analysis in outline of this homily, it will be examined here in tension with Gregory's own claims, and to see how the pair shared a pneumatology. From this analysis, the distinguishing factors will be noted, and used to consider why the apparent breakdown in their relationship, recounted in their letters, occurred in the terms it did, and what this suggests about how Gregory conceived of the Spirit acting in salvation.

As the first half of *Hom*. 15 is concerned with Basil's doctrine of God and his Christology, it can be passed over in favour of the more relevant second half. In making the transition, Basil moves from a discussion of the subject of the resurrection to the economy. Basil presents the soul as purified, capable of leaving behind creaturely nature "like a fish arising from the depths [τις ἰχθὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ βυθοῦ]" and so escaping its accustomed state. From this, Basil builds towards an affirmation of the Spirit, writing that the soul "will perceive the Spirit in that place it perceives the Father and the Son [ἐκεῖ ὄψεται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅπου Υἱὸς, καὶ ὅπου Πατὴρ]."[66] This moves into an argument about the equality of natures and powers, justified through a series of biblical allusions to the adjectives attached to Spirit, referring to them as perfections. Ultimately, this section is concerned to argue that sanctification and life-giving are inseparable from the Spirit. Although Basil leaves it unsaid, such a quality is as inseparable from the Spirit as heat from a fire, to use his metaphor, as they are qualities possessed by the Father and Son. It necessarily follows that they be equally inseparable from the Spirit. His argument is therefore *from* commonality, and not *for* it. That such commonality exists is assumed as a pre-existing understanding on those on the path of purification.

The next section begins with an affirmation of the contemplation of the Spirit as a person of the Trinity, but it is mostly concerned with establishing the Spirit as undiminished giver. Basil writes that "the Spirit gives his grace to all [τὸ Πνεῦμα πᾶσι τὴν παρ' ἑαυτοῦ χάριν παρέχον]" will nevertheless "remain, undiminished and undivided [ἀμείωτον μένει καὶ ἀδιαίρετον]."[67] This giving extends to the angels, to powers, and to the entire universe. Spirit as sanctifier is elevated above the condition of created nature. However, it is the next section that offers a precise explication of exactly what the Spirit does in the economy through his gift of sanctification. This is worth examining in full:

> He illuminates all apprehension of deity, inspires the prophets, instructs lawgivers, perfects priests, strengthens monarchs, steadies the righteous, exalts the temperate, effects grace, makes the dead live, frees the bound, adopts as sons the estranged. From on high he effects these by regeneration. If he seized a faithful tax-gatherer, he produces an evangelist; if he

[66] *Hom*. 15.3. *PG* 31, 468C.
[67] *Hom*. 15.3. *PG* 31, 469B.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

came upon a fisherman, he completes a theologian; if he found a perceptive persecutor, he perfects an apostle to the nations, a herald of faith, a vessel of the chosen.[68]

Although presented somewhat differently, the same pattern of activities is attributed to the Spirit in Gregory's *Or*. 14.27. However, Basil argued from an appeal to biblical history. While, even in Gregory's own work, it is a central premise of scriptural texts that they represent ongoing narratives in which the believer participates or recreates, Basil's lack of a direct connection to the life of the addressee is representative of his approach in *Hom*. 15. Gregory, on the contrary, continually emphasised the reforming, guiding, or elevating action of the Spirit in all of his episcopal orations, even those not explicitly concerned with the Spirit. In those that were, the emphasis was on this action.

The next section follows a similar theme but changes the focus from biblical allusions to direct biblical references, jumping from the "apostle of nations" allusion to directly speaking of how Paul was empowered by the Spirit, along with Peter and John.[69] This repetitious development strengthens the allusive references of *Hom*. 15.3, locating them at the source and following a pattern similar to that found in Gregory's *Or*. 31. The contrast between the applied approach Gregory has taken to the Spirit through 373, and Basil's more intellectual approach is only strengthened by this comparison. Gregory's *Theological Orations* are the same kind of sketch that he previously derided. However, in those orations the biblical witness follows allusion and argument, cementing the case rather than making it. In offering his doxology, Basil ignores the first half of the homily in favour of summarising his comments concerning the Spirit. In this summing up he wrote that:

> And he [the Spirit] has been enthroned in heaven, and he has filled the earth, and is present everywhere, and is uncircumscribed. He dwells wholly in each, and is wholly with God. He does not give gifts as service, yet as authentic grace. For as it distinctly says, to each one as he wills. He is sent forth to the economy, but operates in his own power.[70]

Basil expresses a fairly uncontroversial perspective of the action of the Spirit here, but the terms in which he does so, and the circumstances into which

---

[68] *Hom*. 15.3. *PG* 31, 469B–C. Πάντας φωτίζει πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ κατανόησιν, ἐμπνεῖ τοῖς προφήταις, νομοθέτας σοφίζει, ἱερέας τελειοῖ, ἐνισχύει βασιλεῖς, καταρτίζει δικαίους, σεμνύνει σώφρονας, ἐνεργεῖ χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, ζωοποιεῖ τοὺς νεκροὺς, λύει τοὺς πεπεδημένους, υἱοθετεῖ τοὺς ἠλλοτριωμένους. Ταῦτα διὰ τῆς ἄνωθεν γεννήσεως ἐνεργεῖ. Ἐὰν τελώνην λάβῃ πιστεύοντα, εὐαγγελιστὴν ἀποδείκνυσιν· ἐὰν ἐν ἁλιεῖ γένηται, θεολόγον ἀποτελεῖ· ἐὰν διώκτην εὕρῃ μετανοοῦντα, ἀπόστολον ἐθνῶν ἀπεργάζεται, κήρυκα πίστεως, σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς.

[69] *Hom*. 15.3.

[70] *Hom*. 15.3 *PG* 31, 472B. Τοῦτο καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἕστηκε, καὶ τὴν γῆν πεπλήρωκε, καὶ πανταχοῦ πάρεστι, καὶ οὐδαμοῦ περιέχεται. Ὅλον ἑκάστῳ ἐνοικεῖ, καὶ ὅλον ἐστὶ μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Οὐ λειτουργικῶς διακονεῖ τὰς δωρεὰς, ἀλλ' αὐθεντικῶς τὰ χαρίσματα. Διαιρεῖ γὰρ, φησὶν, ἰδίᾳ ἑκάστῳ, καθὼς βούλεται. Ἀποστέλλεται μὲν οἰκονομικῶς, ἐνεργεῖ δὲ αὐτεξουσίως.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

they were spoken, do make them striking for a theologian whose early pneumatology has been considered lacking. For all that, however, it is equally noteworthy that this discussion is entirely abstract.

III. Dispute with Basil

On the basis of a thorough reading, Radde-Gallwitz notes that Basil had identified the Spirit as an economic agent who, in similar terms to the Son, acts freely for the salvation of Christians, and possesses the attributes of the divine nature. On these grounds, he concludes that Basil, even in 372, had quite a thoroughly worked-out pneumatology that was integral to his understanding of salvation. Radde-Gallwitz therefore posits that the point of disagreement between Basil and Gregory concerning *Hom*. 15 was on whether or not the Spirit was called God. While aceeding to some elements of Radde-Gallwitz's case on the basis of the analysis of *Hom*. 15, this argument requires some further nuance. There are some indisputable points in Radde-Gallwitz's favour: that Gregory did refer to the Spirit as God explicitly in *Ors*. 12 and 13, and that Basil did not directly identify the Spirit as God in *Hom*. 15, or anywhere else until this exchange of letters in 373. However, that the dispute is reducible only to the question of whether or not to directly attribute deity to the Spirit is an oversimplification on the basis of *Or*. 12.6, as is shown in examining the exchange between Gregory and Basil. There are two points of particular interest. First, the line of questioning is only superficially concerned with questions of deity; it is more concerned with particular forms of arguments and their validity. Second, this exchange is part of an ongoing, developing dispute which extended throughout Gregory's early works and into his episcopal orations, and which is particularly concerned with the image of "hiding the light under the bushel." By evaluating these positions in tension with *Hom*. 15 and Gregory's early works, it can be demonstrated that while the question of whether or not to openly declare the Spirit as God provided the frame, the question of the Spirit's action in salvation was the actual issue at hand.

Ep. 58 is the most important epistle to consider, coming from the same period as *Or*. 13, and *Hom*. 15, some time in the autumn of 373. Written by Gregory to Basil, the letter can be read as a crafted rhetorical attempt to highlight Basil's supposed deficiencies in pneumatology. When this is held up against Basil's apparent commissioning of Gregory to undertake to defend the divinity of the Spirit where he could not, it seems more likely to be an ill-considered attempt to highlight increasing dissatisfaction among those who supported a divine Spirit. Gregory's outspoken guest is hardly without criticism for his host, as well as for Basil, although this could be considered a rhetorical device. Regardless, it follows that this interlocutor had recently heard what might have been *Hom*. 15:

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

"I have come just now," he said, "from the gathering in honor of the martyr Eupsychius, and there I heard the great Basil speaking excellent and perfect things about the divinity of the Father and the Son, as no one else could easily do, but sweeping past the Spirit" – and he added some comparison to rivers that run over rocks but hollow out sand.[71]

Anyone familiar with *Hom*. 15 could hardly have accused Basil of demeaning the Spirit when Basil spent the best part of the homily discussing the contours of that subject. Some clarity can be found when re-assessing what is meant by παρασύροντος. Browne and Swallow read παρασύροντος as "slurred," whereas Lampe offers "belittled."[72] Given that παρασύροντος more usually refers to the sweeping away of a stream, or to how one is swept away by an orator, or of gliding, sliding, and dragging, it seems likely that this interlocutor was using evocative language in preparation for his illustration of streams wearing away sand, which Gregory did not repeat. On this basis, it is rendered as "sweeping past" in the translation above in an effort to capture the aquatic and motive sense in keeping with the riparian imagery of the next line. Rather than an unveiled insult to Basil, it is consistent with the overall characterisation of his having addressed the easy rather than the difficult elements of the Spirit's divinity in his comments. This also lends credence to the idea that the subject of the letter did hear *Hom*. 15, which, as discussed in the previous section, addresses the question of the Spirit's divinity by way of illustrations and not experience.

While an apparently minor point, Gregory's characterisation of Basil's position is integral to how arguments are constructed with reference to it. The accepted interpretation of the whole piece – that it is poorly veiled criticism by Gregory – hinges in no small part on establishing the tone of Gregory's narration of events. The questioning nature of the letter is certainly present, but the change from an accusation that Basil belittled or slurred the Spirit instead becomes an instance of reported speech and an oblique charge of having, through an illustration of rivers, taken the easy way out. While some slight against Basil's pneumatology is certainly implied, this modification in tone indicates that it is more likely Gregory is inquiring rather than just ac-

[71] *Ep*. 58.7, trans. Daley, *Gregory of Nazianzus* (London: Routledge, 1996), 179, alt. Gallay, *Lettres* 1, 75. "᾽Εκ τῆς κατ᾽ Εὐψύχιον, ἔφη, συνόδου νῦν ἥκω τὸν μάρτυρα" – καὶ γὰρ εἶχεν οὕτως – "κἀκεῖσε ἤκουσα τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου θεολογοῦντος τὰ μὲν περὶ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ ἄριστά τε καὶ τελεώτατα καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἄν τις ῥᾳδίως ἄλλος, τὸ Πνεῦμα δὲ παρασύροντος," καὶ προσετίθει τινὰ εἰκασίαν ὥσπερ τῶν ποταμῶν οἱ τὰς πέτρας μὲν παρατρέχοντες, τὴν δὲ ψάμμον κοιλαίνοντες.

[72] Radde-Gallwitz follows the Browne and Swallow translation, and thus reads "slurred" for παρασύροντος. Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil*, 101. Haykin follows Lampe in using "belittled." Daley offers "gliding past." This shares the spirit of the translation offered here, and is somewhat less sharp-tongued than those others. See PGL, 1026; also Haykin, *Spirit of God*, 31; Daley, *Gregory*, 179.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

cusing. The interlocutor whose speech was being reported remained prepared to praise Gregory for remarks that readily connect to *Or*. 13:

> Then he said, turning to me, "and why on earth do *you*, my friend, speak so openly of the Godhead of the Spirit" – and he recalled one of my comments, when at a gathering of many people I was speaking of the Mystery of God, and then applied to the Spirit that famous line, "How long shall we hide the light under a bushel?" –"while *he* plays down the fact in murky expressions, and only lays out doctrine in a sketchy way. He will not speak the truth frankly, but bathes our ears in language more political than pious, concealing the ambiguity in the power of his words."[73]

As mentioned earlier, this seems to point back towards *Or*. 12.6. However, as seen throughout this chapter, Gregory returns to the Mt 5:15 reference many times throughout the period. While *Or*. 12.6 is the most directly connected to the Spirit, some caution is warranted in assuming this refers to the time when Gregory was speaking "openly of the Spirit as God." Gregory himself asserted that when he used the quotation he was speaking on the "Mystery of God," which would support the somewhat ambiguous *Or*. 12.6 as the referent. Nevertheless, no direct connection is made between Gregory speaking openly and his using the quote. This captures the character of Gregory's actions throughout 372 to 373. His insistence on the Spirit no longer being hidden – whether allusively by referring to Basil or himself publicising either it or themselves, or directly in *Or*. 12.6 – and his affirmation of the divinity of the Spirit were sufficiently ongoing and strident to warrant both points being raised by this interlocutor. Gregory's defence of Basil hinges upon belittling his own position, and arguing in favour of the use of some reserve, something noted in several of his episcopal orations:

> The better path, then, for us is that the truth be economic, that we yield a bit to our times as one would to a cloud, rather than let the truth be destroyed by the bright clarity of our proclamation. For us, after all, there is no harm in recognising the Spirit as god through other expressions that lead in that direction – for truth is less in sounds than in the understanding; but for the Church, there will be a great loss if truth is put to flight through the defeat of a single man![74]

---

[73] *Ep*. 58.8, trans. Daley, 180, alt. Gallay, *Lettres* 1, 75. "Ἤ τί δή ποτε, ὦ θαυμάσιε, σὺ μέν" – ἔφη πρὸς ἐμὲ βλέπων – "ἤδη φανερῶς οὕτω τὸ Πνεῦμα θεολογεῖς" (καί τινος ἀπεμνημόνευε τῶν ἐμῶν, ὡς ἐν συνόδῳ πολυανθρώπῳ θεολογήσαντος εἶτα ἐπειπόντος τῷ Πνεύματι τοῦτο δὴ τὸ περιβόητον τό· Μέχρι τίνος ὑπὸ τῷ μοδίῳ τὸν λύχνον κρύψομεν;), "ὁ δὲ ὑποφαίνει μὲν ἀμυδρῶς καὶ οἷον σκιαγραφεῖ τὸν λόγον, οὐ παρρησιάζεται δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν πολιτικώτερον ἢ εὐσεβέστερον τὴν ἀκοὴν ἐπικλύζων καὶ τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ λόγου τὴν διπλόην περικαλύπτων."

[74] Ep. 58.11, trans. Daley, 180, alt. Gallay, *Lettres* 1, 76. Βέλτιον οὖν οἰκονομηθῆναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, μικρὸν εἰξάντων ἡμῶν ὥσπερ νέφει τινὶ τῷ καιρῷ, ἢ καταλυθῆναι τῷ φανερῷ τοῦ κηρύγματος. Ἡμῖν μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν βλάβος καὶ ἀπ' ἄλλων λέξεων τοῦτο συναγουσῶν Θεὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα γινώσκειν (οὐ γὰρ ἐν ἤχῳ μᾶλλον ἢ διανοίᾳ

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Much could be made out of the negative connotations of "economy" in this context, but as seen in the consideration of Gregory's orations from 372 to 373, he himself was hardly above using a little reserve. While his programme might have been bold, it remains that he was more than prepared to allude and hint, as is evident here. A certain lack of reserve did arise in him towards the end of 373, but it was largely at Basil's own instigation to pursue his mission more fully and not to hide the light under the bushel – words which Gregory returns to Basil. The final words of the letter are those which have occasioned the greatest comment that Gregory was concerned to get Basil to call the Spirit God:

> At the end of the conversation, I sent them away with arguments like those I have mentioned. But you must give me instructions, my divine and consecrated friend: how far should we come forward in speaking of the spirit as God? What expressions should we use? To what extent should our speech be economic? We need to have a firm front against those who criticise us! For if I were to fail to learn this now – I who of all people know you and your thoughts the best, and who have often both given and received full assurance of this – I would be the most ignorant and the most wretched person of all.[75]

At no point does Gregory ask whether or not he should call the Spirit God. Instead, the focus is what words to use, and how far to use reserve. Gregory is concerned about the direction from which knowledge is approached. This recalls Gregory's comments in *Or*. 12.6, deriding the use of representations or intellectual sketches as opposed to open declarations. Basil's reply comes across as wounded, and the tone is defensive.[76] Taken together with *Hom*. 15, what emerges is not so much a dispute over whether or not the word God is used, but the extent to which a failure to include this disclosure damages arguments concerning the practicalities of the action of the Spirit in the life of the believer.[77] That is to say that it is plausible that a more reserved approach which lays out intellectual arguments can result in a conclusion that the Spirit

---

κεῖσθαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν)· τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ δὲ μεγάλην ζημίαν τὸ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς διωχθῆναι τὸ ἀληθές."

[75] *Ep*. 58.14, trans. Daley, 180, alt. Gallay, *Lettres* 1, 76–77. Τέλος δὲ τοῦ λόγου, τοὺς μὲν οὕτως ἀπεπεμψάμην. Σὺ δὲ δίδαξον ἡμᾶς, ὦ θεία καὶ ἱερὰ κεφαλή, μέχρι τίνος προϊτέον ἡμῖν τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος θεολογίας καὶ τίσι χρηστέον φωναῖς καὶ μέχρι τίνος οἰκονομητέον, ἵν' ἔχωμεν ταῦτα πρὸς τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας. Ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰ δεοίμην νῦν τοῦτο μανθάνειν, ὁ πάντων μάλιστα σέ τε καὶ τὰ σὰ γινώσκων καὶ πολλάκις περὶ τούτων πληροφορίαν καὶ δεδωκὼς καὶ δεξάμενος, πάντων ἂν εἴην ἀμαθέστατός τε καὶ ἀθλιώτατος.

[76] *Ep*. 71.1.

[77] Although there is some ambiguity over the strength of meaning in the idea of linguistic economy, at the very least it contains the idea of avoiding particular language and concepts. See Joseph W. Trigg, "Knowing God in the *Theological Orations* of Gregory of Nazianzus: The Heritage of Origen," in *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Honor of Lloyd Patterson* (ed. Andrew McGowan et al; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 94, n. 58; 94–95.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

must be God, theoretically obviating the need to openly declare it. When the argument begins from the practical experience of Christians, as Gregory's arguments until these points always have, the luxury of assuming a working knowledge of certain Trinitarian mechanics is lost. Rather than being able to work through to that conclusion, it is a predicate of faith, that is, knowledge, that the first principle be an acknowledgment of the Trinity. This is further developed in Gregory's final orations from the period.

D. Mediation Between Christ and the Spirit

I. The Spirit in Gregory the Elder and Julian the Tax-Collector

In the final two orations from this period, delivered in 374, for the anniversary of his father's death and another in honour of Julian, a local tax assessor, Gregory demonstrates the practical integration of his pneumatology and soteriology. Gregory highlighted his father's significance for the salvation of the community. He did the same with reference to Gregory the Elder's own salvation, although in the context of his conversion to Christianity, as a product of "dreams which God often bestows upon a soul worthy of salvation."[78] Gregory the Elder's worthiness, and the means of it, were connected with the Spirit: "[t]he things of the Spirit were exactly known to the man of the Spirit, and he felt that he must [...] make the advantage of the Church and the common salvation his sole object."[79] is worth noting the oblique reference back to the relationship between the Spirit and salvation Gregory makes here. Both the church and the common salvation are "things of the Spirit," and his father a "man of the Spirit" in his pursuit of the congregation's common salvation. In addition, Gregory showed early signs of what he would develop in his later baptismal theology when he wrote that his father "was approaching that regeneration by water and the Spirit, by which we confess to God the formation and completion of the Christ-like man, and the transformation and reformation from the earthly to the Spirit."[80] This is not an exceptional expression in itself; however, within the context of the ongoing debate about the means by which salvation is achieved through the Spirit, it expresses how Gregory

[78] *Or*. 18.12. *PG* 35, 1000A. ὀνειράτων ὄψις, οἷς εὐεργετεῖ πολλάκις Θεὸς ψυχὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ σώζεσθαι. Also *Or*. 18.2.

[79] *Or*. 18.36. *PG* 35, 1033A. Ἤδει τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀκριβῶς ὁ τοῦ Πνεύματος· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μηδὲν ταπεινὸν φρονεῖν ᾤετο δεῖν […] ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἓν βλέπειν μόνον, τὸ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ὄφελος, καὶ τὴν κοινὴν σωτηρίαν…

[80] *Or*. 18.13. *PG* 35, 1000D–1001A. Πρόσεισι μὲν τῇ δι' ὕδατος ἀναγεννήσει καὶ Πνεύματος, δι' ἧς ὁμολογοῦμεν Θεῷ τὴν τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν ἀνθρώπου μόρφωσίν τε καὶ τελείωσιν…

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

firmly located his father in his own camp.[81] While not its central focus, the activity of the Spirit forms a constant frame in the whole oration, to the extent that Gregory opens it with an assertion that his father was "man of desires of the Spirit: for thus Scripture speaks of men advanced and lofty, superior to visible things."[82] Even while Gregory was eulogising his father, he was, not unreasonably, offering a narrative of the transformation of a Christian. In the context of the ongoing debate about the divinity of the Spirit as derived from its action in salvation, the funeral oration for Gregory the Elder was also an apologetic for the divine Spirit.

Although this would be a striking note on which to end this period of Gregory's work on the subject, there remained one more oration before his flight into seclusion at Thekla. Gregory's own human frailty is what became consequential at this point. At the close of this period, he finally acknowledges what is clear from a comparison between his works of 372 to 373 and 373 to 374. He acknowledged that, "nothing I said was able to curb popular talk or the current, all-pervasive passion to speak and lecture on the things of the Spirit without the inspiration of the Spirit[;] I embarked on another course – a better one, I am convinced, and less agonising – that of training everyone to be still by setting an example of my own silence."[83] While this could be interpreted as a reference to Basil, in light of the more irenic re-reading of *Ep*. 58 provided here, this would seem to refer to those against which Basil sought to set Gregory. Rather than openly engage with the question of the Spirit after his challenge to Basil, Gregory seems to have denied both his instincts and his friend by turning to silence.

II. Conclusion

Having examined the development of Gregory's language related to the action of the Spirit in salvation in his early work in Chapter 2, it has been possible to approach the development of these same ideas in 372 to 374. Some specific areas have been considered: those early letters exchanged between

[81] Hägg addresses some of the oddities surrounding Gregory's description of his father's conversion very succinctly, and points to the possibility of Nonna as her husband's "spiritual mother" for her significance in the text. Tomas Hägg, "Playing with Expectations: Gregory's Funeral Oration for His Brother, Sister and Father," in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (ed. Jostein Børtnes et al; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006), 141.

[82] *Or*. 18.1. *PG* 35, 985A. καὶ ἄνερ ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν τοῦ Πνεύματος· οὕτω γὰρ ἡ Γραφὴ καλεῖ τοὺς διαβεβηκότας… 1 Cor 4:1.

[83] *Or*. 19.2, trans. Vinson, 95–6. *PG* 35, 1045B. Ἐπειδὴ λόγῳ τὸν τῶν πολλῶν λόγον ἐπισχεῖν οὐχ οἷός τε ἐγενόμην, καὶ τὴν νῦν κατέχουσαν πάντας φορὰν καὶ προθυμίαν, εἰς τὸ διδάσκειν τε καὶ λαλεῖν τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος χωρὶς Πνεύματος· ἑτέραν ἦλθον, ὡς ἐμαυτὸν πείθω, βελτίω τε καὶ ἀπονωτέραν ὁδὸν, παιδεῦσαι πρὸς ἡσυχίαν ἅπαντας τῷ ἀρχετύπῳ τῆς σιωπῆς·

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Basil and Gregory; Gregory's early episcopal orations and those delivered shortly thereafter; and those works and letters which pertain to his dispute with Basil, along with those came immediately before his retreat into seclusion. On the basis of this analysis it is possible to draw three conclusions. First, the development of language identified in Gregory's early works can be directly connected to the period of 372 to 374 on the basis of his early letters. Gregory began this period concerned that the light of the Spirit should no longer "be hidden under the bushel," and that, in another form of the same allusion, the Spirit's publication of Basil's light "upon the lampstand" would serve to illuminate the truth of the Spirit for the whole church.[84] Second, throughout Gregory's episcopal orations, the problem of how to present the divinity of the Spirit was an unsettled question between Gregory and Basil. The last of Gregory's episcopal orations, *Or*. 12, hinged upon Basil turning the Mt 5:15 allusion upon Gregory, encouraging him not to hide his own light "under a bushel," but to take up his responsibilities and pursue his mission openly. While this resulted in the nuanced and integrated presentation of pneumatological action found in *Ors*. 16 and 17, it also resulted in the dramatic enunciation of the divinity of the Spirit in Gregory's *Or*. 13.

This leads to the third conclusion: that, on the basis of Basil's *Hom*. 15 and the letters exchanged between the two, the dispute between Basil and Gregory was triggered by the public attribution of divinity to the Spirit, but that this was not the basis of the dispute. In fact, the two clearly argued in the same basic terms for the economic action of the Spirit. Gregory's request that his friend "instruct" him how far to proceed in the "theology of the Spirit" depended more upon the use of language, in particular the attribution of economic action to the Spirit.[85] Gregory was concerned that furnishing the Spirit with responsibility for the salvation of believers without attributing divinity to the Spirit undermined not the divinity of the Spirit, but the process of salvation variously identified as deification, purification, illumination, or harmonisation. Concurrently, Basil was problematising the idea that θέωσις, or θεοποίησις – that is, harmony of the church – were truly divine, and not merely the undertakings of fellow creatures inspired by the Spirit. However, without the impetus of the period between 372 to 374 and his dispute with Basil, Gregory would hardly have regarded himself as a defender of the Spirit, as he later claimed to be. This period and its disputes furthered the cause of the Spirit elsewhere. In 374, Basil would compose *DSS*, a text which Gregory would reflect on as having been written by the Spirit itself.[86] Moving towards Constantinople, an awareness of how Gregory articulated the action of the Spirit in salvation must be conditioned by the tensions that underlay

[84] *Ep*. 45.1; *Or*. 6.9.
[85] *Ep*. 58.14.
[86] *Or*. 43.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

this period.[87] Gregory's soteriological pneumatology did not emerge fully formed, nor was it without its own problems. However, the strengthening and development found in 379 was driven by a concern for clarity of language. Further, it was qualified by a consistent application of the principle that the divinity of the Spirit implied its involvement with salvation, and that the exposition and acknowledgement of those actions was central to any case for divinity.

[87] A final note of caution: Basil's offer that Gregory come and assume leadership of those in Caesarea opposed to Basil's positions should not be construed too strongly. *Ep*. 71 was written after *Ep*. 58, and consequently after Gregory had already refused to join his friend. McGuckin puts it well, writing of Basil that he "evidently has little expectation that Gregory will do it…" See McGuckin, *Gregory*, 218.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Chapter 4

Salvation and the Spirit in the Perfect Temple

Chapter 4 explores the orations of the period between 379 and 381, during which Gregory had the opportunity to put his representations of the Spirit's role in salvation to a very public test. The soteriological pneumatology of these orations is principally representational rather than developmental, as seen in Chapters 1 and 2. They are no less significant in how they position Gregory's soteriological pneumatology with relation to the church, the individual believer, and Christ. The first third of the chapter examines the relationship between Gregory's soteriological pneumatology and the church, setting out how his conception of the church follows on from the soteriological role of the Spirit, rather than his view of the Spirit being conditioned by the structure of the church. The second third focuses on those orations Gregory delivered on the arrival of the Egyptian bishops and reflects on the possible significance of Athanasius for Gregory's thought. The final third concerns *Ors*. 41 and 31, the most widely examined of Gregory's works on the Spirit, and re-reads them in light of the conclusions already drawn.

A. The Church in Gregory's Early Constantinople Orations

I. Approaching Constantinople

The orations and letters considered in the last section evidence how Gregory's apparent dispute with and alienation from Basil fuelled an exposition of the role of the Spirit in salvation.[1] In these texts surrounding Gregory's episcopal ordination and his later retreat from public life, this exposition was framed by a desire to do away with "intellectual sketches [διανοίᾳ σκιαγραφούμενον]" and allusions in favour of affirmation of the reality of the Spirit's divinity.[2] The cornerstone of this proposition was the association of the affirmation of the divinity of the Spirit with the personal experience of

[1] The examination of the Constantinopolitan orations will follow the order set out in Beeley, *Knowledge*, 34–53. This differs from others in the location of *Or*. 20 and in grouping *Or*. 21 with those delivered during the visit of Egyptian bishops. Such orderings are necessarily debatable.

[2] *Or*. 12.6.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Gregory and his audience. In the same breath that he derided intellectual sketches, he argued for the shedding of comparisons or likenesses (εἰκαζόμενον), which is to say simple illustrations from the apparent activity of the Spirit in historical examples. Various emphases have been placed on the personal nature of the Spirit's activity. Winslow focused on the Spirit's introduction of the believer to a dynamic process of salvation focused on the Son.[3] Beeley takes a broader focus, and argues that Gregory's wider Trinitarian theology is dependent on the introduction into knowledge actuated by the Spirit. What has been traced so far concerns the language by which the experience of the Spirit is expressed. By following the development of Gregory's thought in line with its context, it has been possible to explicate some of the arguments put forward in the earlier chapters. Moreover, the analysis has demonstrated both the presence and the concrete development of individual, experiential soteriological pneumatology. Moving forward, this permits an examination of how Gregory explicates the experiential allusions and metaphors of his earlier work – not just with more detail, but with appeal to the sketches he had previously maligned. Gregory's early thought covered almost a decade from 362 to 373, with a further absence until his installation at Anastasia in Constantinople in 379. This period, the most productive of Gregory's prose career, only lasted until 382. This intensive activity led to some of the most significant developments in Gregory's view of the Spirit in salvation.

Attempts to understand Gregory's thought in this period often recourse to his principle argument for the divinity of the Spirit: If the Spirit is not to be worshipped (προσκυνητόν), how can he baptise (βαπτίσματος)? If he is worshiped, is he not to be adored (σεπτόν)? If he is adored, he is God (θεός).[4] As syllogistic reasoning goes, this is fairly clear. That its premise is vulnerable to the claims of Gregory's more sophisticated opponents – if the Spirit is an activity of God, worship belongs to God, for example – is easily overlooked in an effort to endorse it as a foundational statement of Gregory's pneumatology. The "golden and saving chain" is, Gregory himself wrote, only that which can be admitted by those who assert the silence of the text on the divinity of the Spirit: "One links with the other, a truly golden and saving chain. From the Spirit comes our rebirth; from rebirth comes a new creating, from new creating a recognition of worth of him who affected it. Yes, this is

[3] Winslow, *Dynamics*, 144. Winslow's argument for the new creation as accomplished in Christ, and θέωσις as an operation of the Spirit in that new creation is emblematic of his Christological prioritisation.

[4] *Or*. 31.28. SC 250, 332. Without assenting to all of the arguments presented therein, Alexander Golitzin. "Adam, Eve, and Seth: Pneumatological Reflections on an Unusual Image in Gregory of Nazianzus's 'Fifth Theological Oration,'" *Anglican Theological Review* 83, no. 3 (2001): 537–47 presents an interesting take on another of Gregory's less powerful images exploring the status of the Spirit.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

what one can say on the premise *it is not in the Bible* [my emphasis]."[5] The apparent absence of a more developed treatment to this effect in Gregory's writings has led most of his interlocutors to focus their attention on the figure of Christ in his soteriology. However, the problem is not that Gregory failed to address the absence; rather that, in writing on the subject of the Spirit's action in salvation, he worked from a first principle. What lay beyond was to be clear only to those who had already accepted the first principles of the Spirit, and which was to appear as the unassailable assumption of reasonable men to those who had not. For him to address such a problem directly would degrade Gregory's rhetoric of strength. The greater force of his argument for the divinity of the Spirit and its soteriological action is to be found in the Biblical exempla of the divine Spirit's action, which he includes after the mention of the golden chain.[6]

This is not a suggestion that later commentators on Gregory overlooked or ignored the role of the Spirit. That Gregory's appearance in post-conciliar florilegia, and the first attribution of the title "the Theologian" to him, is concerned with Christology is attributable to the context of the aftermath of Chalcedon.[7] Instead, something of a category error has occurred. In either accepting the greater part of Gregory's soteriology (which is Christologically charged) as complete, or in attempting to address the underdevelopment of scholarship on Gregory's pneumatology, a small but critical overlap in the two doctrines has been missed, to the detriment of both.[8] Much of the resolution to this is to be found in how Gregory presented his understanding of the church. The concept of the church is one that has dogged inquiry into Grego-

[5] *Or*. 31.28–29, trans. Wickham, 139, alt. SC 250, 332. Ἔν ἤρτηται τοῦ ἑνός, ἡ χρυσῆ τις ὄντως σειρὰ καὶ σωτήριος. Καὶ παρὰ μὲν τοῦ πνεύματος ἡμῖν ἡ ἀναγέννησις· παρὰ δὲ τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως ἡ ἀνάπλασις· παρὰ δὲ τῆς ἀναπλάσεως ἡ ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἀξίας τοῦ ἀναπλάσαντος. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν εἴποι τις ἂν τὸ ἄγραφον ὑποθέμενος·

[6] Opperwall, "Holy Spirit," 159.

[7] Price, *Acts*, 117. This is discussed in the project introduction. The ubiquitous nature of the title in later works somewhat obscures its origin. See Gregory's later biographer, Gregory the Presbyter, who describes him as ὁ τῆς θεολογίας ἐπώνυμος. Gregory the Presbyter, *Life*, 1.1. *CC* 44, 120. On the post-Chalcedonian context of Gregory's title in fine see Langworthy, *Theodoret's Theologian*.

[8] This is discussed at length in the introduction. On whether or not Gregory himself would have conceived of distinct doctrines, it seems sufficient to acknowledge that he understood there to be individual institutions of knowledge of God expressed as specifically qualified θεολογίαν, as in "τριάδος θεολογίαν" from *Or*. 31.26–27. Θεολογίαν in this sense is usually translated as doctrine, and it does not do much violence to Gregory's thought to do so. Behr's exposition of the theologian's increasing knowledge of "doctrinal facts" as opposed to "development of doctrine" in Gregory's thought. See John Behr, *The Formation of Christian Theology Part Two: One of the Holy Trinity*, (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004), 368.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

ry's pneumatology. While its importance is universally accepted, the exact contours of how the individual character of the Spirit's action – deifying, baptising, and so on – coheres with the implicitly communal nature of the church is an unresolved question. Although most of the texts to this point have dealt with the action of the Spirit in the individual, there do appear metaphors like harmonisation, introduced in Chapter 2 and further developed later in Chapter 4, in Gregory's early thought. These ideas point towards the complexity of Gregory's rejection of a simple binary between individual and communal salvation: for him, the church was inseparable from the congregation, the congregation from the individual.[9] It finds its communality in its constitution of the body of Christ, but the individuality of members is never abrogated. Even more, the church community is not bounded in simple structural terms: the church includes monastic communities, isolated hermits, and, in its beginnings, even those outside of baptism. This, ultimately, is the real subject of the majority of Gregory's work in this period: expositing not just how the Spirit works in salvation, but how the Spirit works in the believer in a manner which precedes and exceeds baptism.[10]

1. Seeking Salvation in Luke 19:9

Now raised to the see of Constantinople as part of the on-going episcopal politics of the period, Gregory begins to undertake the concretisation of the themes first announced in his first episcopal orations, evidencing a realisation of his claims as a defender of the divinity of the Spirit. The first of Gregory's orations in this period, from his exposition of his theology to his new congregation at the Anastasia villa-church he initially occupied, is as general a reflection as one can expect from an oration that is itself a composite.[11] Perhaps as a consequence of Basil having written *DSS* in the period of Gregory's absence, and his own elevation to a powerful public position, Gregory seems disinclined to produce the "intellectual sketches" Gregory himself derided.[12] This first oration of his Constantinopolitan career is neither a rigorous deconstruction of his opponents' positions, nor an abstract theological reflection. Gregory had been alone among his contemporaries in arguing for the divinity of the Spirit on the basis of experience. At the outset of his career at Constan-

[9] Aquinas in *On the Apostle's Creed*, 9, makes a statement to this effect. *Or*. 31.26.

[10] Much of Winslow's "Economy of the Spirit" is concerned solely with baptism. On the contrary, must be remembered that on an evidentiary basis most of Gregory's orations in this period would have been to those already baptised and, as Gregory understood it, progressing in their purification. Winslow, *Dynamics*, 143.

[11] McGuckin, *St Gregory*, 243–44. McGuckin offers an extensive treatment not just of the textual history of *Or*. 20 and subsequent dating issues, in addition to a convincing argument that it represented a kind of first draft for his works in 381.

[12] *Or*. 12.6.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

tinople, Gregory captured two ideas and grounded them in the Spirit, to be returned to continuously while bishop of that city: the image of purification beginning from the recreation of the individual believer as temple and, following from this, the harmonisation of these living temples into the collective body of Christ in order to constitute the church in the world. While both these concepts were developed in his *Theological Orations*, their early deployment points to the natural progression of Gregory's thought on soteriological pneumatology from his early episcopal career. The Spirit stood, ever more boldly, as the agent of earthly salvation and transformation, active and visible in and through the text of Scripture; related to, but ultimately distinct from, either human salvation accomplished in Christ or the knowing-known of God after death.

In setting out his programme, Gregory wrote that in "putting to death what is earthly in me and wasting my lowly body, then I shall both receive Christ, who will say to me, 'Today salvation has come to this house,' and I shall obtain salvation and live a more perfect life […]"[13] This quote from Luke 19:9 pertains to some complex elements of Gregory's thought: first, the importance of personal purification; second, the reception of Christ as a condition of being able to live a perfect life. Delivered in the context of a sermon, these lines lend themselves to a straightforward reading. The house becomes the house of the Lord, or the church. However, this ignores the context of the quote. Luke 19:9 was the paradigm of Gregory's concept of Christ as saviour: Christ came to save the lost, but Zacchaeus is not found so much as seeks. Even before he encounters Christ, he is earnest in seeking him out, and has given away half his wealth to the poor. Although Jesus proclaims that salvation had come to Zacchaeus' house, it is the action of the individual seeking to purify him or herself first that makes this possible. In his assertion that he would go on to live a more perfect life on receiving that salvation, the possibility of post-mortem or post-eschatological reading is marginalised. While he is often engaged in implicit exegesis, Gregory is still dedicated to the plain sense of the text as instructive for salvation. The equation of individual with physical structure, as in the case of Luke 19:9 where the house refers to Gregory himself, was integral to Gregory's soteriological pneumatology.

2. Living Temples

He expands on this theme of the individual as structure – in this case a temple – later in the same passage:

[13] *Or*. 20.4, trans. Vinson, 109. SC 270, 64. νεκρώσας τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ μωράνας τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως· τότε καὶ Ἰησοῦν εἰσδέξομαι, καὶ ἀκούσομαι· "Σήμερον σωτηρία τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ"· καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας τεύξομαι, καὶ φι λοσοφήσω τὰ τελεώτερα […]

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

So, knowing these things, and that no one can be worthy of our great God, who was both victim and high priest, unless he first presents himself to God as a living sacrifice, or rather, becomes a living holy temple of the living God, how could either I myself blithely launch into a discussion about God or countenance anyone who, without further ado, does the same?[14]

Gregory's representation of the individual as part of a process of salvation occurring within an individual finds its firmest expression in this idea of the creation of the living temple and is a reflection of Luke 19:9. This recreation of the individual as temple, of which Christ is high priest, stands as the initial expression of Gregory's thought on purification. Gregory referred to God four times, as part of three distinct movements or elements of salvation. Mirroring the recitation of Zacchaeus' story, it begins from the God who is victim and high priest – Christ – who creates the possibility of salvation and becomes the image upon which the individual must model themselves. Next, again like Zacchaeus, the individual presents himself or herself to God by becoming a sacrifice, which is a living temple of God, made through the Spirit. A pause is called in any speculation about God until such a sacrifice is undertaken. It is no coincidence that this process mirrors the golden chain to which Gregory would later refer. Nevertheless, he opened this oration with caution, writing, "[b]efore we rise above it as far as possible and sufficiently purify our ears and minds, I think it is dangerous either to accept the responsibility for other souls or to take up theology."[15] This a standard of Gregory's self-deprecating correction of others – he had already taken up responsibility for their souls, and thus must have at least been sufficiently purified, deified, or saved himself – consistent with his position in *Or*. 2. The caution is that the believer should not take up theology, and that Gregory would not enjoin them to speculation:

Be content with what abides within you; let the rest abide in the treasuries of heaven. By an upright life; through purification obtain the pure. Do you wish to be a theologian one day, worthy of divinity? Conduct is the stepping stone to contemplation. Devote your body to the service of your soul.[16]

[14] *Or*. 20.4, trans. Vinson. SC 270, 62. Ταῦτα οὖν εἰδὼς ἐγὼ καὶ ὅτι μηδεὶς ἄξιος τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ, καὶ θύματος καὶ ἀρχιερέως ὃς μὴ πρότερον ἑαυτὸν παρέστησε τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν ζῶσαν, μᾶλλον δὲ, ναὸς ἅγιος ἐγένετο Θεοῦ ζῶντος καὶ ζῶν, πῶς ἢ αὐτὸς προχείρως ἐγχειρήσαιμι τοῖς περὶ Θεοῦ λόγοις ἢ ἀποδέξομαι τὸν ἐγχειροῦντα θρασέως;

[15] *Or*. 20.1, trans. Vinson, 95. SC 270, 58. Πρὶν δὲ ταύτην ὑπερσχεῖν, ὅση δύναμις, καὶ ἀνακαθᾶραι ἱκανῶς τά τε ὦτα καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἢ ψυχῆς ἐπιστασίαν δέξασθαι ἢ θεολογίᾳ προσβαλεῖν οὐκ ἀσφαλὲς εἶναι γινώσκω.

[16] *Or*. 20.12, trans. Vinson, 115. SC 270, 80–82. Τὸ μὲν ἀγάπησον ἐν σοὶ μένον, τὸ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἄνω θησαυροῖς μεινάτω. Διὰ πολιτείας, ἄνελθε· διὰ καθάρσεως, κτῆσαι τὸ καθαρόν. Βούλει θεολόγος γενέσθαι ποτὲ, καὶ τῆς θεότητος ἄξιος; τὰς ἐντολὰς φύλασσε· διὰ τῶν προσταγμάτων ὅδευσον· πρᾶξις γὰρ ἐπίβασις θεωρίας·

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

While this goes some way to explaining Gregory's reserve despite the protestations of his early episcopal career, he is not entirely economical with his language. In setting out the aims of their recreation as living temples, Gregory appeals directly to previously identified actions of the Spirit as the agent of change in the life of the individual and the end to which they reach:

> If while on this earth I may not possess to perfection knowledge of all that exists, what remains to me? What may I hope for? The kingdom of heaven, you will surely say. And I believe this to be nothing other than the attainment of that which is most pure and perfect; and the most perfect of the things that are is the knowledge of God.[17]

The ultimate end of their recreation and purification in this life lies in knowledge of God. The agent of this attainment, in one who has started to separate true from false doctrine, is the Spirit, as asserted in the latter section of *Or.* 20.4. The role of the Spirit at this level is well understood. This is not the bold insistence on the divinity of the Spirit and its action in the life of the believer seen in his first episcopal orations. On the contrary, it is a cautious approach and an insistence that through purification, contemplation, and the action of Christ as God, believers can discern true from false doctrine and come to breathe on behalf of the Spirit, ultimately aiming towards more perfect knowledge of God. Critically, however, Gregory appends this with the caution that "one part" can be secured, "another" can be reached, but the rest remains in the other life.[18] Some caution is therefore necessary when the Spirit is associated with ideas of illumination and knowledge of God. These ideas represent a culmination, or perfection, which is not necessarily located this side of death.[19] The work of the Spirit as described or alluded to by Gregory in these passages, on the other hand, is firmly rooted in this world. However, both processes begin in the creation of living temples before expanding to encompass all the elements here. Although delivered into the church, this interpretation would seem to suggest an individual focus, belying the structural, collective language of houses and temples which surrounds it. Gregory resolves this in a later oration to the same church community, not by appealing to the church as a whole, but by returning to the idea of harmonisation and the body of the church as more than a mere collection of individuals.

---

[17] Ibid. SC 270, 82. Εἰ μὴ δυνατὸν ἐνταῦθα ἔχειν τελείαν τὴν τῶν ὅλων γνῶσιν, τί μοι τὸ λειπόμενον; Τί τὸ ἐλπιζόμενον; Βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, πάντως ἐρεῖς. Ἡγοῦμαι δὲ μὴ ἄλλο τι τοῦτο εἶναι ἢ τὸ τυχεῖν τοῦ καθαρωτάτου τε καὶ τελεωτάτου· τελεώτατον δὲ τῶν ὄντων, γνῶσις Θεοῦ.

[18] *Or.* 20.12.

[19] This would not be inconsistent with the idea of θέωσις as an "outworking of an existing soteriological union," but does pose a more substantial role for the concept as proposed by Gregory. See James Gifford, *Perichoretic Salvation: The Believer's Union with Christ as a Third Type of Perichoresis* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 81.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

II. Peace in the Temple

While the theme of setting aside physicality in pursuit of purification is familiar from Gregory's earlier works, and will recur throughout his Constantinopolitan orations, themes of unity and peace emerge strongly here.[20] These themes recall several of Gregory's earlier works delivered into similar church contexts. The idea of different paths to salvation resulting in different eschatological outcomes remained strong, though now joined with this impetus towards peace, to the extent that "the blessedness reserved for the peacemakers is so great that they alone of the ranks of the saved are called the sons of God."[21] In his celebration of St Cyprian, albeit not the saint on whose feast day it was delivered, Gregory highlights Cyprian's woes as "his path to salvation [σωτηρίας ὁδὸς]."[22] While it is easy to point to the celebration of martyrdom throughout the early church, in the context of Gregory's soteriology it is a reminder that the evolution of his thought is not an overwriting of past material, but a refinement and a refocusing as a result of changing context. However, it would be a mistake to assume that this focus on peace is only a consequence of his changed circumstances and an attempt to address conflict in his church. On the contrary, Gregory here explored the idea of "temple-making," related to the imagery and action of the Spirit, which sat alongside and radically underpinned the function of bringing the believer to knowledge of God.

The knowledge-bringing aspects of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology has constituted the major area of study since at least Althaus and Winslow, and has been especially well observed by Beeley.[23] While undeniably important, such a focus places the emphasis on post-eschatological completion in death, as observed in *Or*. 20.12. As Gregory indicated, there can be no perfect knowledge in life, so one should hope for the kingdom, which is knowledge of God to the degree that the believer is known.[24] This is congruent with the function of the Spirit in the prototype of the "golden chain" introduced in the same oration, by which the Spirit directs to Christ, and from Christ to God. This is a chain that leads across and outside of history, however, and whose completion cannot be examined. What then of the Sprit's temple-making? The recreation of believer as temple also marks a significant progression towards purification, towards knowledge of God, and as part of this towards an inner peace, or sublimation of the passions.[25] Gregory alluded

[20] See *Or*. 22.13, 22.15, and 23.13.

[21] *Or*. 22.15, trans. Vinson, 129. See below for Greek.

[22] *Or*. 24.8. SC 284, 52.

[23] Beeley, *Trinity*, 178.

[24] *Or*. 20.12.

[25] Gregory often made his idealisation of contemplative tranquility known, but for a particularly useful consideration of the immediate philosophical context see Francis Gau-

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

to this when he explicated how such individual ethical reception of grace should occur in the church:

> [W]e should incline rather to peace as the more Godlike and sublime course. How absurd it is to hold that harmony constitutes the greatest good in private life but does not serve the public interest in like degree; and that the best managed household and city are those that display the least possible internal dissension or none at all, but if they do, very quickly return to normal, their wounds healed, while for the community of the church, on the other hand, there is some other standard that is better and more seemly. It is also absurd that each and every person strives for inner peace (peace being our individual goal, along with the mastery of the mastery of the passions) but does not show himself the same to others, believing instead that his neighbour's ruination is his own renown; and that God bids us forgive even those who trespass against us not just seven times but with a frequency based on the conviction that forgiving is the guarantor or our being forgiven, while we, on the other hand, are more eager to maltreat even those who do us no harm than to receive kindness from others.[26]

Peace, therefore, sits alongside the "mastery of the passions," usually regarded as part of purification, as the goal of the individual. Gregory completes this lengthy quotation by making reference to the peacemakers being called the sons of God. So significant is this movement towards peace that to err in it is to risk salvation secured in the church.[27] For Gregory, it therefore followed that this peace should be extended outwards as well, and most significantly towards other members of the church, writing that, "Why do we, the disciples of peace, engage in wars which do not admit of treaty or truce? Why are we, the disciples of the chief corner stone, detached from one another?

---

tier, *Le retraite et le sacerdoce chez Grégoire de Nazianze*, Bibliotheque de l'École des Hautes Études, vol. 114. Sciences Religieuses (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002) 83ff, especially 91–93. While Gregory's early orations cited a desire for this tranquility as a foil for Gregory's assent to be in the world, it should be remembered that his third ways still drew on the importance of peace for spiritual progress. Here, this is simply explicitly relocated to the soul.

[26] *Or*. 22.15, trans. Vinson, 128–29, alt. SC 270, 252–54. τοῦτο γὰρ ὑψηλότερόν τε καὶ θεοειδέστερον. Ὡς ἔστιν ἄτοπον ἰδίᾳ μὲν ἄριστον ὑπολαμβάνειν τὸ τῆς ὁμονοίας, δημοσίᾳ δὲ μὴ λυσιτελέστατον· καὶ οἰκίαν μὲν καὶ πόλιν ταύτην ἄριστα διοικεῖσθαι, ἥτις ἂν μηδὲν ἢ ὡς ἐλάχιστα στασιάζῃ πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἢ τοῦτο πάσχουσα, τάχιστα ἐπανίῃ καὶ θεραπεύηται, τῷ δὲ κοινῷ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἄλλο τι βέλτιον εἶναι καὶ πρεπωδέστερον· καὶ αὐτὸν μὲν ἕκαστον, ὅπως ἂν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν εἰρηνεύῃ σπουδάζειν – εἰρήνη δὲ τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον αἱρετὸν, καὶ ἡ κατὰ τῶν παθῶν δεσποτεία –, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἄλλους μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν φαίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἡγεῖσθαι δόξαν ἑαυτοῦ, τὴν τοῦ πλησίον κατάλυσιν. Καὶ τὸν μὲν Θεὸν παριέναι κελεύειν καὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν εἰς ἡμᾶς μὴ ὅτι ἑπτάκις ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις τοσοῦτον, ὡς τοῦ ἀφιέναι τὸ ἀφίεσθαι προξενοῦντος… There are some interesting parallels with Augustine in *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum* 1.22–24 here. See Lewis Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 53–54.

[27] *Or*. 22.13.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Why do we, the disciples of the rock, wobble this way and that [καὶ οἱ τῆς εἰρήνης, πολεμοῦμεν ἀκήρυκτά τε καὶ ἀκατάλλακτα; καὶ οἱ τοῦ ἀκρογωνιαίου, δι ιστάμεθα; καὶ οἱ τῆς πέτρας, σειόμεθα]?"[28] Functionally, the church is an outward representation of the internal, individual purification of its collected members – in no sense does it represent in itself an advancement of those ends. When focus is restricted only to the idea of purification as mastery of passions, or of illumination as knowledge, the church can begin to recede into the background as merely a setting, or be pushed forward as the only space where such movements are permitted. Neither of these are valid on the basis of Gregory's own characterisation. However, the peace toward which Gregory encourages his congregation is one that exceeds humanity. It is, as with much of Gregory's thought on salvation, part of an ethical movement towards the divine:

> [T]he gift that I and many people have exchanged with one another – I do not know whether it is in every case a sincere profession and worthy of the Spirit and not just the sort of conventional public gesture that God refuses to countenance and that brings down upon ourselves even greater condemnation! Beloved peace, my practice and my adornment – we hear that it both belongs to God and characterizes God, represents in fact the very essence of God, as the Scriptural expressions, the peace of God, and the God of peace, and he is our peace, attest, though this is not the way that we honor him![29]

In seeking peace within themselves, the believer moves towards ethical likeness to the divine. The peace of God in Gregory's understanding was not simply on the basis of scriptural references. The unanimity of will in the Godhead is evidence of and for this peace – it is a defining part of the divine nature, and the action of the Godhead in the economy, seen in Chapter 1. It is also a function of soteriological pneumatology firmly rooted in the daily experience of believers this side of death. The peace-bringing love exchanged between congregants must be sincere, and not merely a platitude unworthy "of the Spirit." That is to say, they are to reflect the object of their striving – God – in their "practice" for it to be a fit "adornment." A basis for this can be found in Gregory's likely source for his comments in *Or*. 22.1, 1 Jn 4:12–13, "No one has seen God at any time; if we love one another, God abides in us and, his love is perfected in us. By this we know that we abide in him, and he

[28] *Or*. 22.4, trans. Vinson, 120. SC 270, 226.

[29] *Or*. 22.1, trans. Vinson, 117, alt. Μελέτημα and καλλώπισμα have been changed to "practice" and "adornment." SC 270, 218. ὃ νῦν ἔδωκα τῷ λαῷ καὶ ἀντέλαβον· οὐκ οἶδα εἰ παρὰ πάντων γνησίαν φωνὴν καὶ ἀξίαν τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἀλλὰ μὴ δημοσίας συνθήκας ἀθετουμένας ὑπὸ Θεῷ μάρτυρι, ὥστε καὶ μεῖζον εἶναι ἡμῖν τὸ κατάκριμα. Εἰρήνη φίλη, τὸ ἐμὸν μελέτημα καὶ καλλώπισμα, ἣν Θεοῦ τε εἶναι ἀκούομεν καὶ ἧς Θεὸν, τὸν Θεὸν καὶ αὐτόθεον, ὡς ἐν τῷ· "Ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ·" καὶ "Ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης·" καὶ "Αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν·" καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως αἰδούμεθα.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

in us, because he has given us of his Spirit."[30] If their "practice" falls short of the Spirit within them, it is not a worthy "adornment" – it does not move the believer towards the divine. Thus, the Spirit guides the believer not just into knowledge, through emulation of Christ, but individually into the pursuit of peace, and through the outward expression of that peace into the perfection of the love of God. This theme was amplified throughout Gregory's time in Constantinople, but notably in his orations on Athanasius and on the arrival of the Egyptian bishops in Constantinople.

B. Deification, Harmony, and the Spirit

I. Hierarchy and the Believer

Although Gregory's oration on Pentecost represents some of his most detailed work on the Spirit, the orations that preceded it are examples of how Gregory integrated his maturing soteriological pneumatology with the practical and biblical basis for his understanding of the Spirit's action in salvation. Four orations, in particular *Ors*. 32, 33, 21, and 34, delivered within the period of his episcopacy between 379 and 380, form part of his attempt to secure his see and ensure the ascendancy of his doctrine in the city. Gregory drew extensively on the language of harmony and shared history in connection with the Spirit. In examining these themes and trying to draw them to the surface, it is not these orations as such that are of interest; but by locating them in their context, the specific themes – and the means Gregory uses to present them – become all the more apparent.

In the first case, Gregory relied heavily on Paul in a manner consistent with the relationship examined in the previous chapter. This reliance on a dialogue with Paul is amplified when Gregory speaks about unity in the church. It is surely no coincidence that Gregory, whose relationship with Paul is characterised more by the allusion than direct appeal, suddenly found himself directly referring to the divine apostle (θεῖος Ἀπόστολος). This term itself only appears once before 379 – in *Or*. 14 – but five times after that year.[31] The sudden resurgence of direct reference underlines how Gregory saw his own mission in Constantinople paralleling or continuing Paul's own. This sequence of orations is located at the heart of Gregory's Constantinopolitan ministry, in which he is attempting to not only unmake the existing religious consensus of the city but preserve and expand his own, Nicene influence. In pursuit of this, *Ors*. 32 and 33 share many common themes, foremost among them an emphasis on eschatologically reinforced harmony

[30] *NASB*.
[31] *Ors*. 32.1, 36.12, 40.9, and 45.6.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

brought about in his audience by the Spirit, which Gregory derives from Paul. That this will be the tone of his oration is established early when, in speculating that the motives of his enemies may be the consequences of strife, he asserts that: "'God knows,' says the divine Apostle, and the day of revelation will make manifest, and the last fire which judges or purifies all that is ours ["Ὁ Θεὸς οἶδε," φησὶν ὁ θεῖος Ἀπόστολος, καὶ δηλώσει σαφῶς ἡ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως ἡμέρα καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον πῦρ, ᾧ πάντα κρίνεται ἢ καθαίρεται τὰ ἡμέτερα]."[32] Gregory is clear that the functioning of the church is bound up with order and unity. He collapses Rom 12:5 and Eph 4:16 together, writing that, "'we are all one body in Christ and individually members of Christ and one another.' The one rules and presides while the other is led and directed; and the two do not operate the same, since ruling and being ruled are not the same, yet each become one in Christ, 'joined and fit together' by the same Spirit […]."[33] The first quotation is from Rom 12:5, the second Eph 4:16. The connection between them, provided by Gregory, reflects his investment in the operation of the Spirit. Neither text contains a reference, but Gregory nevertheless expands on Rom 12:5 by Eph 4:16, and Eph 4:16 through the Spirit. This rhetorical interpolation also leaves aside any concern for particular gifts, focusing instead on a distinction between those with and those without authority.

In his usual fashion, Gregory is not content to leave it at Christ, as Paul does. Instead Gregory introduces the agent of salvation, ending his sentence by adding that they are "harmonised and joined together by the same Spirit [ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ "συναρμολογούμενα" καὶ συντιθέμενα Πνεύματος]."[34] This joining together, consistent with the harmonising Gregory identified as a work of the Spirit in his earlier orations, did not operate with perfect equanimity. As addressed in Chapter 2 with reference to Gregory's *Or*. 2, his understanding of church authority was closely connected to the purification or deification of the individual. In turn, this passage also reflects Gregory's anthropology as identified in Chapter 1. The soul's possession of intellectual authority, of rationality or the will, strongly suggests that those who are more deified are more qualified to lead because of their capacity to understand. This was emphasised in his oration on Athanasius.

Gregory was more keen to follow the example set by Paul and emphasise his own authority by progress when he glossed 1 Cor 2:13, writing that "[t]he one is rich in contemplation, and he rises above the many, and he spiritually

[32] *Or*. 32.1; 1 Cor 3:13. SC 318, 84.

[33] *Or*. 32.11. SC 318, 108. πάντες "ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ· οἱ δὲ καθ' ἕνα Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἀλλήλων μέλη." Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἄρχει καὶ προκαθέζεται, τὸ δὲ ἄγεται καὶ εὐθύνεται, καὶ οὔτε ταυτὸν ἀμφότερα ἐνεργεῖ, εἴπερ μὴ ταυτὸν ἄρχειν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι· καὶ γίνεται ἀμφότερα ἓν εἰς ἕνα Χριστὸν, ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ "συναρμολογούμενα" καὶ συντιθέμενα Πνεύματος.

[34] Ibid.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

interprets the spiritual, and inscribes, threefold, on his heart the word that edified all, and the many, and that which edified some, not many or all, and certainly does not lift up the poor man, and indeed frequents the deeps."[35] The riches of contemplation that Gregory describes sit apart from the image of contemplative asceticism he evoked in his earlier works. On the contrary, this richness expresses itself precisely through the degree that it serves to interpret truth to the many. This edification for all, many, and some are equally inscribed on his heart, prepared for use in the unification and movement towards the divine of his congregation.[36] That it possesses a mundane character, in so far as it expresses itself through a church community free of strife, belies the degree of importance Gregory attached to this work of the Spirit. This contrast is highlighted by the third sense, which Gregory alluded to as one which does not lift up, but instead treads the deeps. Moreschini suggests the three-fold structure implied in the passage was a reference to the senses of Scripture.[37] There were, for Gregory, layers of meaning which were not necessarily beneficial to all. There is some ambiguity as to whether the poor man is one who was spiritually poor, or if Gregory actually means that the poor are not helped by this sense. However, the Spirit is, in Gregory's contemporary age, firmly in the sense that edifies all.

The images of universality and commonality become less concerned with the immediate situation of the church in Gregory's *Or*. 33, following shortly after *Or*. 32. To some extent this generalisation is attributable to the nature of his concern: unity of belief across the body of the church, rather than merely within the community he was addressing at the time. In addressing himself against ideological opponents, however, the central principles of soteriological harmony and unity remained as his starting points. The difference lies in that, rather than beginning from a position informed by the divine apostle's view of church order, Gregory begins from the divine order that bracketed his earlier oration. This is not to say that his thinking is uninformed by his reading of Paul. On the contrary, he supplements his reading of Paul with one of Genesis in establishing the commonality of humanity:

> […] and moreover beyond this we have in common reason, law, prophets, the same suffering of Christ, by whom we have been renewed, not one or the other, but all who partake of the same Adam, and were misled by the serpent, and put to death by sin, and are saved by

[35] *Or*. 32.24. SC 318, 134–36. Ὁ μέν τις πλουτεῖ θεωρίᾳ καὶ ὑπὲρ τοὺς πολλοὺς αἴρεται, καὶ πνευματικὰ συγκρίνει πνευματικοῖς, καὶ ἀπογράφεται τρισσῶς ἐπὶ "τὸ πλάτος τῆς καρδίας" τὸν πάντας οἰκοδομοῦντα λόγον, καὶ τὸν πολλούς, καὶ τὸν τινὰς ἀντὶ πλειόνων ἢ πάντων, καὶ οὐκ ἀνέχεται πένης ὢν, καὶ ἐμβατεύει τοῖς βάθεσιν.

[36] Elm, "Individual and Community," 92. See also Tollefsen, "*Theosis*," 270. Affiliation, likeness, and other language attempting to triangulate the limits of deification are of certain value, but Tollefesen's question of "who could set the limits" of deification is apt.

[37] SC 318, 136, n. 1.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

the heavenly Adam, and drawn back to the tree of life, over the tree of shame, from which we had fallen.[38]

This relatively straightforward adaptation of Paul's own interpretation of Genesis serves a further purpose in Gregory's thought. While there is an equal share in the alienation of mankind from the divine, the process of redemption and remaking through the Spirit – a call to which Gregory offers in his oration – is extended only to those who embrace the Trinity in its fullness. That is to say that "everyone lofty has one country [Πᾶσι μία τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς πατρὶς]," which points toward the redemption of the flesh and citizenship in the world in favour of citizenship in a new Jerusalem.[39] While not necessarily certain, it is plausible that his audience would be familiar with the idea of Roman citizenship models.[40] What Gregory wished to set up is a strict binary between shared, unredeemed humanity, and a realised eschatology of citizenship in a future divine state. It is in this spirit that he justifies his own coming to Constantinople, writing: "[t]hus it is, and because of this, I am set over you, I who am of a small and despised country, and that not by my will, nor self-sent, like many now leaping to the first rank; still, I was summoned, and pressed, and have followed after fear and the Spirit."[41] Gregory has come to the congregation he addresses from a weak, worldly country, but compelled by a call from the Spirit who transforms them into citizens of a higher country. It is towards the efficacy of the Spirit in effecting this change that the oration works, and towards the establishment of a divine Spirit capable of these acts. This apologetic context must be kept in sight.

Although Gregory's opponents in the city were defined principally by their rejection of a fully divine Spirit, it is important to keep in sight Gregory's own self-identification as an advocate and missioner of the Spirit.[42] So, in castigating his opponents, it is to the whole Trinity that he appeals, though with a particular emphasis on the work of the Spirit: "They have the houses,

[38] Or. 33.9. SC 318, 176. καὶ ἔτι πρὸ τούτων, κοινὸν λόγον, νόμον, προφήτας, αὐτὰ τὰ Χριστοῦ πάθη, δι' ὧν ἀνεπλάσθημεν, οὐχ ὁ μὲν, ὁ δ' οὔ, πάντες δὲ οἱ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἀδὰμ μετασχόντες, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄφεως παραλογισθέντες, καὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ θανατωθέντες καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἐπουρανίου Ἀδὰμ ἀνασωθέντες καὶ πρὸς τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς ἐπαναχθέντες διὰ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ἀτιμίας, ὅθεν ἀποπεπτώκαμεν. The biblical background is instructive. See Gen 3:1, 3:6, 3:22, 1 Cor 15:22, 1 Cor 15:42, 15:45, 15:49.

[39] *Or*. 33.12. SC 318, 182.

[40] Elm, *Fathers of the Church* is instructive on the complicated boundaries of identity in this area of Gregory's thought.

[41] *Or*. 33.13. SC 318, 184. Οὕτω μὲν οὖν καὶ διὰ ταῦτα, ἐπέστην ὑμῖν ὁ μικρὸς ἐγὼ καὶ κακόπατρις, καὶ τοῦτο οὐχ ἑκὼν οὐδ' αὐτεπάγγελτος, κατὰ τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν νῦν ἐπιπηδώντων ταῖς προστασίαις, ἀλλὰ κληθεὶς καὶ βιασθεὶς καὶ κατακολουθήσας φόβῳ καὶ Πνεύματι.

[42] *Ors*. 10, 12, 13 in particular.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

we the inhabitant; they the temples, we God; and ours 'to be living temples of the living God,' and to live, living sacrifices, intellectual burnt-offerings, perfect offers, gods through obeisance to the Trinity."[43] Fully half of this line invokes, by reference to living temples, one of the central roles played by the Spirit in Gregory's theology. While opposing a wide range of opponents, it is the transformation of his audience by the Spirit that works to make their opposition effective. While, ultimately, they are gods by adoration of the Trinity, and to the extent that all economic action is wholly Trinitarian, this temple-making is impossible without recourse to a Spirit which harmonises them to each other, and in doing so makes them temples. Gregory expands on this theme of the power of the Spirit, turning to a theme of baptismal power in two telling lines:

> What do you say, destroyers or repeaters of baptism? Can one be spiritual without the Spirit? Or participate in the Spirit if he does not honour the Spirit? Or honour him, if he is baptised into a creature or fellow-slave?[44]

> What were you baptised into? The Father? Good, except still Jewish. The Son? Good, not Jewish, but not perfect. The Holy Spirit? Roar it! This is perfect. Was it into these singly, or a common name? Yes, common. What was it? Clearly, God.[45]

In asking these rhetorical questions, Gregory highlights three central elements of his thought that have run throughout these Constantinopolitan orations. In both cases, these can be read as simple affirmations of the divinity of the Spirit. Indeed, the arguments implied here appeared more forcefully in *Ors*. 41 and 31: namely, that if the Spirit is necessary to perfection and a baptism that is effectual, then it follows that the Spirit must be divine. This is true, but superficial. Underlying this are two ideas that had more weight in Gregory's particular context. First, for Gregory, to be "spiritual" is to have accepted the Spirit. The idea that no progress is possible without the Spirit is a constant theme throughout Gregory's early works, sometimes connected with effectual baptism (which is to say, one that includes the Spirit) – but here an explicit connection is made with being spiritual, a state which precedes baptism. As has already been shown, Gregory perceives the working of

[43] *Or*. 33.15. SC 318, 188. Ἔχουσιν οὗτοι τοὺς οἴκους, ἡμεῖς τὸν ἔνοικον· οὗτοι τοὺς ναοὺς, ἡμεῖς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ τὸ "ναοὶ Θεοῦ γενέσθαι ζῶντος" καὶ ζῶντες, ἱερεῖα ἔμψυχα, ὁλοκαυτώματα λογικὰ, θύματα τέλεια, θεοὶ διὰ Τριάδος προσκυνουμένης. The referent is 2 Cor 6:16.

[44] *Or*. 33.17. SC 318, 194. Τί φατὲ, οἱ καταβαπτίζοντες, ἢ ἀναβαπτίζοντες; Ἔστιν εἶναι πνευματικὸν δίχα Πνεύματος; Μετέχει δὲ Πνεύματος ὁ μὴ τιμῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα; Τιμᾷ δὲ ὁ εἰς κτίσμα καὶ ὁμόδουλον βαπτιζόμενος;

[45] Ibid., 196. Mt 28:19. Rom. 6:4. Εἰς τί ἐβαπτίσθης; εἰς Πατέρα; Καλῶς· πλὴν, Ἰουδαϊκὸν ἔτι. Εἰς Υἱόν; Καλῶς· οὐκ ἔτι μὲν Ἰουδαϊκὸν, οὔπω δὲ τέλειον. Εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα; Ὑπέρευγε· τοῦτο τέλειον. Ἆρ' οὖν ἁπλῶς εἰς ταῦτα, ἢ καί τι κοινὸν τούτων ὄνομα; Ναὶ κοινόν. Τί τοῦτο; Δηλαδὴ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

the Spirit in the believer to come before, but to be perfected after. The reason why is unpacked here.

Following from this is the idea of baptism perfecting this spirituality. It is not merely a matter of the Spirit pointing the believer up towards re-creation, but of real change in the believer in the moment. While this change is effected through baptism, that is not the change in itself. Instead, it is through observable changes in behaviour to be less human and more divine. Gregory himself admits – and many commentators have made much of the idea – that a person can never really become God as such.[46] However, to suggest that a change in relation to each other and to the world can never mark a movement towards what is divine in humanity misunderstands Gregory's understanding of how virtue, and the realisation of that virtue in the Godhead, operates. One of the most important aspects of this has been the expression of harmony and unity in the congregation, examined here, and which was developed further in Gregory's other orations as bishop of Constantinople. Indeed, his whole programme in Constantinople should be understood in terms of harmony and order as divine, over and against disorder, which is material. His purpose, then, was to inculcate a process of deification in terms of ethical development towards divine order, expressed in mutual harmony. He envisioned that this would be achieved through the action of the Spirit in him and thus in his congregation. Gregory wrote of his opponents that: "They were of one mind for ill; while we were for all good, and the unanimous glorification of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit with one voice, that we may say, God is among us, unites those who unite him, and glorifies those who glorify him."[47]

II. Equality in Authority

The two orations Gregory composed on the arrival of the Egyptian bishops to Constantinople go further in expressing the interaction between church, Spirit, and salvation in his thought. Tellingly, it is when he placed himself in continuity with the former Alexandrian bishop Athanasius that he made evocative connections between harmony and the Spirit. In this case, it is worth noting that Gregory's emphasis on the action of the Spirit, the im-

[46] Tollefsen, "According to Gregory," 92; Russell, *Deification*, 224; Winslow, *Dynamics*, 189; John McGuckin, "The Strategic Adaptation of Deification in the Cappadocians," in *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions* (ed. Michael Christensen et al; Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007), 101–2.

[47] *Or*. 23.4. SC 318, 286. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ κακῷ συνεφρόνουν· ἡμῖν δὲ ἐπὶ παντὶ βελτίστῳ τὰ τῆς ὁμονοίας ἵν' ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἑνὶ στόματι δοξάζωμεν τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ τοῦτο λέγηται περὶ ἡμῶν ὅτι· "Ὄντως ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν, ὁ τοὺς ἑνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἑνῶν, καὶ δοξάζων τοὺς δοξάζοντας"·

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

portance of harmony, and the unity of the deified individual are ideas central to Gregory's own work and to his Constantinopolitan project. Whatever connections might be drawn with Athanasius, his status as a former bishop of Alexandria, and the audience of Egyptian bishops warrants his service as Gregory's subject.[48]

> He stood a horn of salvation when we were cast down, and in due season lay a cornerstone, knitting us to himself and one another, or a purifying fire to our base and wretched matter, or a farmer's winnowing-shovel separating the light and weighty in belief, or a sword cutting out the roots of evil. And so the Word finds in him an ally, and the Spirit lays hold of one who will breathe in his defence.[49]

The theme of communal unity and peace remains strong, as does the denigration of matter. There are twinned images at the beginning and end of the line: a horn of salvation and a chief corner stone, and Athanasius as the ally of the Word, possessed by the Spirit and breathing on behalf of the Word. Knowing Athanasius at least as a fellow-traveller in defence of orthodoxy, this imagery is not surprising.[50] Gregory exceeds the soteriological pneumatology presented by Athanasius himself, as seen in Chapter 1. The language of a believer breathing on behalf of the Spirit occurs many times in Gregory's thought. While there are several different permutations, they all recall Rom 8:26–7, but amplify it. The believer is not just aided by but expresses the Spirit. The prior series – cornerstone, fire, farmer's fan, and sword – are equated with each other and strengthened by their association with the process of finding allies of the Word who act on behalf of, and in concert with, the Spirit. The principle image Gregory offered, of a cornerstone that serves to bind together, is paralleled with purification, winnowing, and excision of wickedness. This is to say that the images of harmony identified throughout Gregory's early Constantinopolitan orations, and elsewhere in his works, are here made equal to far more commonly-used purification language.

Concern over the limits of deification language is attributable less to Gregory's own use of case specific language than it is to the later appropriation of that language. Gregory was conscious of and ready to acknowledge the limits inherent in created beings. In his oration on Athanasius, Gregory affirms the one of the consistent themes identified in his thought – that while

---

[48] McGuckin, *St Gregory*, 248.

[49] *Or*. 21.7. SC 270, 124. Διὰ τοῦτο ἠγέρθη κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν ἤδη κειμένοις, καὶ λίθος ἀκρογωνιαῖος, συνδέων ἑαυτῷ τε καὶ ἀλλήλοις ἡμᾶς, ἐνεβλήθη κατὰ καιρὸν, ἢ πῦρ καθαρτήριον τῆς φαύλης ὕλης καὶ μοχθηρᾶς, ἢ πτύον γεωργικὸν, ᾧ τὸ κοῦφον τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τὸ βαρὺ διακρίνεται, ἢ μάχαιρα τὰς τῆς κακίας ῥίζας ἐκτέμνουσα· καὶ ὁ Λόγος εὑρίσκει τὸν ἑαυτοῦ σύμμαχον, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα καταλαμβάνει τὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πνεύσοντα.

[50] Hanson, *Search*, 678 is instructive in the lack of influence by Athanasius on the Cappadocians generally. As an addendum to this, Gregory's "eulogy" was delivered on the occasion of Egyptian bishops visiting his city.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

all of the language orbiting deification which Gregory employs, particularly θέωσις and θεοποίησις, is consistent with ethical progression effected by the Spirit, such terms largely point towards an eschatological state. He writes: "to hold converse with God, and be mixed with unmixed light as far as suited to human nature! Blessed is he by his ascent hence, and his deification there, which is earned by true philosophy, and by rising above the dualism of created matter, through the unity perceived in the Trinity."[51] Understanding the distinction between the mixing appropriate to nature, which forms man's ascension towards an eschatological state in which deification proper can occur, is integral to seeing the Spirit as the proper agent of salvation in Gregory's thought. That is to say, Gregory affirmed that perfection is a function of the unity of the Trinity – thus the golden chain – but that the process of salvation achieved through true philosophy and experienced in the moment is less abstract, more concrete, and is attributable to the Spirit particularly. But perhaps even more notably, Gregory located the place of Athansius' deification – there, not here. However, the process which precedes it is still a recreation of the individual in a divine fashion: "For such is the grace of the Spirit: it makes of like honour those who are of like mind. My people! For you are mine, if distant, because we are divinely joined together, and not in the material way; bodies are joined in place, but souls are joined together [harmonised] by the Spirit."[52]

This is part of Gregory's ongoing interaction with Paul in this period, and throughout his career, which has a tendency to paraphrase Paul while emphasising the presence of the Spirit. While Paul identifies Christ as the chief cornerstone, he goes on to say that this fitting together as a temple of God is done in the Spirit.[53] Rather than a contradictory or inconsistent interpretation, Gregory is engaged in an expansive exegesis of Paul. His interaction with this section of Ephesians is further reinforced when he rhetorically asks of his opponets why they "make me, who is a temple of the Holy Spirit, thus of God, the hut of a creature [με ποιεῖς, ναὸν ὄντα "τοῦ Πνεύματος" ὡς "Θεοῦ," κατοικητήριον κτίσματος]."[54] These verses affirmed Gregory's

[51] *Or*. 21.2. SC 270, 114. Θεῷ συγγενέσθαι, καὶ τῷ ἀκραιφνεστάτῳ φωτὶ κραθῆναι, καθόσον ἐφικτὸν ἀνθρωπίνῃ φύσει, μακάριος οὗτος τῆς τε ἐντεῦθεν ἀναβάσεως καὶ τῆς ἐκεῖσε θεώσεως, ἣν τὸ γνησίως φιλοσοφῆσαι χαρίζεται καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ τὴν ὑλικὴν δυάδα γενέσθαι διὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ Τριάδι νοουμένην ἑνότητα.

[52] Or. 34.6. SC 318, 206. Τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις· ὁμοτίμους ποιεῖ τοὺς ὁμόφρονας. Λαὸς ἐμός· ἐμὸς γὰρ, εἰ καὶ πόῤῥωθεν, ὅτι θεϊκῶς συναπτόμεθα καὶ τρόπον ἄλλον ἢ ὃν αἱ παχύτητες. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ σώματα τόπῳ συνάπτεται, ψυχαὶ δὲ Πνεύματι συναρμόζονται. See Beeley, *Knowledge*, 158, for a short exposition. See also 223, n. 147 on the complex revelation of the Trinity.

[53] Eph 2:21–23.

[54] *Or*. 34.12. SC 318, 220. Moreschini suggests derivation of quoted terms from 1 Cor 6:19 and 1 Cor 3:16–17 respectively. See Moreschini, SC 318, 220, n. 12a; 12b.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

insistence on the temple-making activity of the Spirit, but here serve as the basis for his development of the temporal, experiential activity of the Spirit. The harmonisation experienced by believers is part of their ethical transformation, a mixing or remixing of their essential nature to better resemble the divine image.

In summarising his argument, Gregory offered a quotation that has come to be closely associated with him: "And the sum of my discourse: with the Cherubim give glory – who unite the three Holies into one Lord, and which reveal the first essence as they open their wings to the diligent. Be illuminated with David, who said to the Light: in your light shall we see Light, as it were, in the Spirit we shall see the Son."[55] However, his quotation from Psalms does not overshadow that which follows, which is itself a precursor to arguments he will present in *Or*. 31: that the Son is sought in the Spirit. This is only a summary. As seen in the whole of his argument, however, the purpose of the Spirit is more than this role of conveyance. Although the deification of humanity accomplished in the Son, it remains the Spirit who guides, empowers, and realises this salvation in the individual. What Christ accomplished in the incarnation and completes in the eschaton subsists in the Spirit joined to the believer. Salvation is prefigured even before baptism in the reformation of the individual and in their relationship to others. The believer is made more divine in ways that are unique to Gregory's conceptions of divinity and humanity. This divinisation is only made less accessible when the experiential, personal nature of a humanity, which is by its creation mixed with the divine – and capable, to that extent, of being mixed with unmixed light – is obscured. This was a concern Gregory himself voiced as early as 374 in his urgings against Basil's intellectual sketches. On the other hand, Gregory indulged in sketch and summary at two notable points in his career: *Or*. 41, his oration on Pentecost, and *Or*. 31. These two orations, more than any others, have been the locus of scholarly attention on Gregory's pneumatology and its relation to his soteriology. As noted, the intent of this study is not to supplant the literature on this subject, but instead to supplement and clarify those areas left unaddressed. To this end, rather than undertaking a close reading of these two orations, it is possible to demonstrate that the more comprehensive and grounded view of the Spirit's action in salvation articulated so far is consistent with the summary Gregory himself presented therein.

[55] *Or*. 34.13. SC 318, 220. Κεφάλαιον δὲ τοῦ λόγου· Μετὰ τῶν χερουβὶμ δόξασον, συναγόντων τὰς τρεῖς ἁγιότητας εἰς μίαν κυριότητα καὶ τοσοῦτον παραδεικνύντων τῆς πρώτης οὐσίας, ὅσον ὑπανοίγουσι τοῖς φιλοπόνοις αἱ πτέρυγες. Μετὰ Δαβὶδ φωτίσθητι, πρὸς τὸ φῶς λέγοντος· "Ἐν τῷ φωτί σου ὀψόμεθα φῶς," οἷον ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τὸν Υἱόν· Ps 36 (37).

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

C. Salvation in Christ and the Spirit

I. The Agency of the Spirit

When approaching *On Pentecost*, it is tempting to appeal to the well-trod lines of *Or*. 41.9 that "[i]t is through him [the Spirit] that the Father is known, and the Son is glorified; and from them alone that he is known."[56] On the basis of its content, *Or*. 41 is one of the most extensive expositions of Gregory's pneumatology to be found in his corpus; and its context, being delivered in celebration of Pentecost, represents a rich seam of both pneumatological and soteriological thought. Unfortunately, *Ors*. 41 and 31 are little more than expansions or clarifications of this summary of Gregory's position. Particularly in *Or*. 41, Gregory's appeal to his audience that they be content in celebrating the mystery in *Or*. 41.10 might frustrate examination, but it is exactly this which *Or*. 41 set out to reinforce: not knowledge, but mystery.[57] It is an articulation of the basic mysteries, and an introduction to the approach to knowledge, as it were. As such, *Ors*. 41 and 31 provide a context to consider the more complex interactions of personal experience and ethical progress, mediated by the Spirit, towards deification after death (as identified throughout Gregory's corpus). Moreover, *Ors*. 41 and 31 demonstrate that these interactions are accurately reflected in Gregory's more extensively studied summative or apologetic works. Several passages from *Or*. 41 demonstrates the complexity of his expression on this subject.

> This Spirit works together with the Son in creation and the resurrection. Be persuaded by the text: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and by the Breath of his mouth all power in them"; and, "It was the Spirit of God that made me, it is the Breath of the Almighty that teaches me"; and again, "You shall send forth your Spirit, and they shall be created, and you shall renew the face of the earth." He is the creator of spiritual regeneration. Be persuaded by the text: "None can see the Kingdom, or receive it, unless he is born again of the Spirit, and be cleansed of the first birth – which is a mystery of night – by a remaking of day and the light, by which each is remade.[58]

---

[56] *Or*. 41.9. SC 358, 336. δι' οὗ Πατὴρ γινώσκεται καὶ Υἱὸς δοξάζεται καὶ παρ' ὧν μόνων γινώσκεται· See McGuckin, *Gregory*, 274 for a discussion of these lines in particular.

[57] Kharlamov is broadly right that "[d]eification for patristic writers essentially is both the actual experience and the mystery," although this requires some careful qualification in the case of Gregory. Vladimir Kharlamov, "Theosis in Patristic Thought," *Theology Today* 65, no. 2 (2008): 168.

[58] *Or*. 41.14. SC 358, 344–46. Τοῦτο τὸ Πνεῦμα συνδημιουργεῖ μὲν Υἱῷ καὶ τὴν κτίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν. Καὶ πειθέτω σε τὸ "Τῷ Λόγῳ Κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν"· "Πνεῦμά" τε "θεῖον τὸ ποιῆσάν με· πνοὴ δὲ παντοκράτορος ἡ διδάσκουσά με"· καὶ πάλιν· "'Εξαποστελεῖς τὸ Πνεῦμά σου καὶ κτισθήσονται, καὶ ἀνακαινιεῖς τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς." Δημιουργεῖ δὲ τὴν πνευματικὴν ἀναγέννησιν· καὶ πειθέτω σε

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Gregory's appeal to the equality of Spirit and Son in action, demonstrated by Scripture, is followed by the more developed point, which serves as a proof from experience. That Gregory assigned a particular role to the Spirit – author of spiritual regeneration – offers no paradox for him. Equal partaking in action through a unanimity of will does not prevent him from assenting to a progression of presence which he saw as laid out in Scripture. The present activity of salvation is undertaken by and particular to the Spirit, because it is the Spirit that is the new Paraclete. That the horn of salvation, Christ, should have borne responsibility for identical functions does not create a problem. On the contrary, it highlights the degree of interdependence between his Christology and pneumatology when viewed with regard to salvation, but also shows the line of the Spirit and the ongoing gospel story in which his hearers are expected to participate. That such progress takes place is secondary to the question of what, exactly, that progress entails.

That it is a spiritual progress, formed of practical affiliation of the character of the believer towards a divine standard, aided and realised by the Spirit, has been the argument so far. Gregory lays out precisely this sort of structure in his description of the function of the Spirit. He presented the manifestations of the Spirit in such a way that positively, but broadly, agrees with the remaking of the believer through the Spirit:

> The Spirit initially operated in the angels and heavenly powers, and those first after God, and from God. For from no other is their purification and illumination, and imperviousness towards sin, or immovability, but from the Holy Spirit. Thereafter, in the Patriarchs, and in the prophets, some of whom had God revealed to them, or knew him, and others predicted the future with the chief part of their soul imprinted with the Spirit: they attended to future events as if they were at hand. Such is the power of the Spirit. Then he operated in the disciples of Christ – I do not speak of Christ, in whom the Spirit did not operate, but accompanied as equals; and in three ways, as they could receive him, and at three critical times; before Christ was glorified by the Passion, after he was glorified by the resurrection, after his ascension to Heaven, or re-instatement, or whatever to call it.[59]

τὸ "Μηδένα δύνασθαι τὴν βασιλείαν ἰδεῖν ἢ λαβεῖν, ὅς τις μὴ ἄνωθεν ἐγεννήθη Πνεύματι," καὶ τὴν προτέραν ἐκαθαρίσθη γέννησιν, ἣ νυκτός ἐστι μυστήριον, ἡμερινῇ καὶ φωτεινῇ διαπλάσει, ἣν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἕκαστος διαπλάττεται. The references are to Ps 32 (33):6; Job 33:4 (Septuagint); Ps 103 (104):30; Jn 3:5 respectively.

[59] *Or*. 41.11. SC 358, 338. Τοῦτο ἐνήργει, πρότερον μὲν ἐν ταῖς ἀγγελικαῖς καὶ οὐρανίοις δυνάμεσι, καὶ ὅσαι πρῶται μετὰ Θεὸν, καὶ περὶ Θεόν. Οὐ γὰρ ἄλλοθεν αὐταῖς ἡ τελείωσις καὶ ἡ ἔλλαμψις, καὶ τὸ πρὸς κακίαν δυσκίνητον ἢ ἀκίνητον, ἢ παρὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ἔπειτα ἐν τοῖς Πατράσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς Προφήταις, ὧν οἱ μὲν ἐφαντάσθησαν Θεὸν ἢ ἔγνωσαν, οἱ δὲ καὶ τὸ μέλλον προέγνωσαν τυπούμενοι τῷ Πνεύματι τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν καὶ ὡς παροῦσι συνόντες τοῖς ἐσομένοις· τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος δύναμις. Ἔπειτα ἐν τοῖς Χριστοῦ μαθηταῖς – ἐῶ γὰρ Χριστὸν εἰπεῖν, ᾧ παρῆν, οὐχ ὡς ἐνεργοῦν, ἀλλ' ὡς ὁμοτίμῳ συμπαρομαρτοῦν –, καὶ τούτοις τρισσῶς, καθ' ὅσον οἷοί τε ἦσαν χωρεῖν, καὶ

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

The first part of this passage provides the framing for the greater part of Gregory's argument. The Spirit as a source of perfection and illumination is located in the first place identified with the angels. Angels, whose natures Gregory will later argue are simple by creation, could be moved to sin.[60] Although different in nature from humanity, then, the Spirit still provided the source of their perfection. The shift from the angels to prophets and patriarchs, taken together as possessing powers of witness in one form or another, is sudden but not inconsistent. Just as the angels require the Spirit for their purity and illumination, so too did the prophets and patriarchs require the Spirit to perceive God, and to prophesy, as the case may be. Their powers were not their own, but were instead a consequence of their reason, or rational soul, being impressed upon by the Spirit in much the same way that Gregory intended for his listeners.[61]

In presenting Christ as having possessed – but not being possessed by – the Spirit in a way similar to that of the believer, Gregory offers an insight into how, exactly, he conceives of the Spirit dwelling in those he discusses at this stage: the Spirit exists as an operational (ἐνεργοῦν) force. In the disciples, then, there are three more manifestations: healings and exorcisms, their inspiration on the resurrection, and, the tongues of fire after Christ's ascension.

He first manifested in the purification of disease and of spirits, which quite clearly could not be done without the Spirit; and after the economy, the breathing upon, which clearly was divine inspiration; and the division of the fiery tongues, which we celebrate. The first manifestation was obscure, the second more clear, and the present perfect: not still at hand as an operation, as the first, but substantially, one might say, but is present, and living with us. For it was seemly that the Son consorted with us corporeally, and [the Spirit] is dis-

---

κατὰ καιροὺς τρεῖς· πρὶν δοξασθῆναι Χριστὸν τῷ πάθει, μετὰ τὸ δοξασθῆναι τῇ ἀναστάσει, μετὰ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάβασιν, ἢ ἀποκατάστασιν ἢ ὅ τι χρὴ λέγειν.

[60] *Carm*. 1.1.4.92. See also *Carm*. 1.1.6.53–67 on the fall of Lucifer as a consequence of pride. In that instance, Gregory described angelic nature as δύστροπος, rather than δυσκίνητον, but the sentiment, if not the Platonic associations of the latter, remains the same. *Or*. 38.9 also touches on this.

[61] The ἡγεμονικὸν upon which the Spirit impressed relates to the soul in Stoic philosophy – reason, or the chief part of the soul. Gregory's wide-ranging adoption of philosophical language is well attested. Maslov, "Limits" is instructive on his reception of Stoicism in this regard. For a suggestive consideration of Gregory's attitude in this regard, see Claudio Moreschini, "Gregory Nazianzen and Philosophy, with Remarks on Gregory's Cynicism," in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (ed. Christopher Beeley; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2012), 103–22. For a useful primer on especially Stoic thought on the signification of names and naming see Christopher Stead, "Logic and the Application of Names to God," in *El "Contra Eunomium I" en la Produccion Literaria de Gregorio de Nisa: Sixth International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa* (ed. Lucas Mateo-Seco et al; Pamploma: Universidad de Navarra, 1988): 303–20. Despite the title and the volume it is, by the author's own admission, a much broader study.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

closed corporeally; and after Christ ascended, the Spirit descended to us – coming because Lord, sent because not rival God: such words show the harmony, as well as the separation, of natures.[62]

Of these three manifestations the first two are operations – that is to say, they are not indwellings. They are, according to Gregory, indistinct and more express manifestations, respectively. The obscure nature of these manifestations goes some way towards explaining their apparent inconsistency with the other examples Gregory offers. There is no mention of the Spirit impressing upon Christ's disciples' reason or souls as with the prophets or patriarchs. Neither are these manifestations particularly related to purity or illumination, which explains Gregory's need to hedge them as somehow obfuscated. The final manifestation, however, is a more perfect one. It is a movement from an energetic to a substantial manifestation, and a change from just a granting of powers to an opening of the possibility of spiritual regeneration through personal affiliation to the divine, as hinted at in *Or*. 41.14. This manifestation was more than merely perfect, but a reflection of Christ and Christ's possession of the Spirit.[63]

Christ possessed the Spirit as a personal indwelling of equals while humanity, and presumably the angels, possessed the Spirit as an energising force. When Christ ascended and was absent from the world in body, then the manifestation of the Spirit in humanity became perfect, and reflective of that corporeal disclosure of Christ and the Spirit in Christ. The parallel is not only in presence, but in possession. The Spirit is "substantially" and "corporeally" present to the believer in the same way that Christ was before his ascension and possessed in the same way as Christ possessed the Spirit, though not as an indwelling of equals.[64] Simply put, the Spirit is as present to the believer, and to Gregory, as Christ was to his own disciples.

This concurs with the idea seen in Gregory's earlier works – the Spirit provides access to an ethical progression towards affiliation to the divine that

[62] *Or*. 41.11. SC 358, 338–40. Δηλοῖ δὲ ἡ πρώτη τῶν νόσων καὶ ἡ τῶν πνευμάτων κάθαρσις, οὐκ ἄνευ Πνεύματος δηλαδὴ γενομένη, καὶ τὸ μετὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἐμφύσημα, σαφῶς ὂν ἔμπνευσις θειοτέρα, καὶ ὁ νῦν μερισμὸς τῶν πυρίνων γλωσσῶν, ὃ καὶ πανηγυρίζομεν. Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, ἀμυδρῶς· τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἐκτυπώτερον· τὸ δὲ νῦν τελεώτερον, οὐκέτι ἐνεργείᾳ παρὸν ὡς πρότερον, οὐσιωδῶς δὲ, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, συγγινόμενόν τε καὶ συμπολιτευόμενον. Ἔπρεπε γὰρ, Υἱοῦ σωματικῶς ἡμῖν ὁμιλήσαντος, καὶ αὐτὸ φανῆναι σωματικῶς, καὶ Χριστοῦ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐπανελθόντος, ἐκεῖνο πρὸς ἡμᾶς κατελθεῖν· ἐρχόμενον μὲν ὡς Κύριον, πεμπόμενον δὲ ὡς οὐκ ἀντίθεον. Αἱ γὰρ τοιαῦ ται φωναὶ οὐχ ἧττον τὴν ὁμόνοιαν δηλοῦσιν ἢ φύσεις χωρίζουσιν. The "breathing upon" may refer to Jn 20:22, per SC 358, 340, b.

[63] See also Christopher Beeley, *The Unity of Christ: Continuity and Conflict in Patristic Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 184–86

[64] *Or*. 41.11.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

is patterned on the Gospel accounts of Christ.[65] That this is necessary, and cannot be accomplished solely through Christ, is pointed towards in Gregory's final words of this passage. These actions of the Spirit must be accompanied by the Spirit because to purify and illumine is interior to the Spirit's nature. The Spirit came to do these things as an expression of divine nature, which is defended against a denigration to the status of a creature, as when Gregory writes that "[t]hey who reduce the Holy Spirit to the rank of a creature are shameless, and craven slaves, and worst of the worst: for it is the part of craven slaves to deny the power of a master, and to rise up against lordship, and share his slavery with that which is free."[66] That the Spirit is divine is, by this point, a lesser mystery than how this divinity is manifested in the believer. Gregory wrote that, "[y]ou who receive the things of the Spirit, receive himself in addition, that you may not only grapple, but grapple lawfully, which is the condition of your crown. May this reward of your conversion be granted, that you may confess the Spirit perfectly and proclaim with us, and before us, his due."[67] This easily-overlooked passage presents the reception of the things of the Spirit, but not the Spirit itself, as the reward of conversion.

It is, however, a laurel that grants access to struggle rather than a reward for it. The convert is inducted into a wrestling match in order to come to proclaim the Spirit perfectly. It is only when this has been undertaken that they can proceed to proclaim the full due of the Spirit before their congregation. Taken in concert with the rest of the oration, the Spirit's due is clear: acknowledgement to purify and illumine is in the nature the Spirit in a way that is not in the Father or Christ. That is to say, that the Spirit is fully divine in the terms of its own operation, and not merely as an activity or expression of the other persons. For Gregory, this apparent contradiction is worked out not only through the Scriptural witness of the experience of the angels, patriarchs, prophets, disciples, and Christ, but through the experience of his very audience.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

---

[65] Hofer, *Christ*, principally on the subject of how Gregory self-conceives as Christ.

[66] *Or*. 41.6. SC 358, 326. Τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οἱ μὲν εἰς κτίσμα κατάγοντες, ὑβρισταὶ καὶ δοῦλοι κακοὶ καὶ κακῶν κάκιστοι. Δούλων γὰρ κακῶν ἀθετεῖν δεσποτείαν, καὶ ἐπανίστασθαι κυριότητι καὶ ὁμόδουλον ποιεῖν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ ἐλεύθερον.

[67] *Or*. 41.8. SC 358, 332. οἱ τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἔχοντες, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα προσλάβετε, ἵνα μὴ ἀθλῆτε μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ νομίμως, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ὁ στέφανος. Οὗτος ὑμῖν δοθείη τῆς πολιτείας μισθὸς, ὁμολογῆσαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τελείως καὶ κηρύξαι σὺν ἡμῖν τε καὶ πρὸ ἡμῶν ὅσον ἄξιον. Parallels with 2 Tim 2:5 are apparent.

II. The Life of Christ as Context

Although Gregory was placed in the position of having to defend his affirmation of the Spirit's divinity, necessitating an appeal to simpler arguments than found in other orations, *Or*. 31 is not short of connections to Gregory's larger theological project.[68] He does not shy away from affirming one of his core arguments, which can be followed through from *Or*. 41, that revelation continues through the agency of the substantially present Spirit: "The Saviour had certain truths which he said could not at that time be borne by his disciples, filled though they had been with a host of teachings. These truths, for reasons I well may have mentioned, were therefore concealed. He also said that we should be taught all things by the Holy Spirit, when he made his dwelling in us."[69] By this point, it is already clear that the teachings of the Spirit include the Spirit's own divinity as chief among them.[70] Instead, Gregory locates the source of his authority for the divinity, as first principle, in Christ's own words:

> Explain to me where you are going to put "procession" which is evidently a mean term between alternatives and was introduced by a better theologian than you, our Saviour? I take it what you have not composed a new New Testament and on the strength of it removed the phrase: "The Holy Spirit which proceeds from the Father." Insofar as he proceeds from the Father, he is no creature; inasmuch as he is not begotten, he is no Son; and to the extent that procession is the mean between ingeneracy and generacy, he is God. Thus God escapes your syllogistic toils and shows himself stronger than your exclusive alternatives.[71]

The Spirit's procession and subsequent first principle of divinity, then, is not a matter of intellectual sketches or even ongoing revelation, but a clear fact which can only be rejected if the words themselves are removed from the text. In his *Theological Orations* Gregory provides, by his reasoning, a similar sort of incontrovertible basis for the recreation of believers through the

---

[68] See *Or*. 30.1, where he attributes the lack of development in his arguments there to the speed with which they are laid out.

[69] *Or*. 31.27, trans. Wickham, 138, alt. SC 250, 330. Ἦν τινὰ τῷ Σωτῆρι, καὶ εἰ πολλῶν ἐνεπίμπλαντο μαθημάτων, ἃ μὴ δύνασθαι τότε βασταχθῆναι τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐλέγετο, δι' ἃς εἶπον ἴσως αἰτίας, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παρεκαλύπτετο· καὶ πάλιν πάντα διδαχθήσεσθαι ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνδημήσαντος.

[70] See Jn 14:26. It is as significant as Jn 15:26 for the next passage.

[71] *Or*. 31.8, trans. Wickham, 122, alt. SC 250, 290. Ποῦ γὰρ θήσεις τὸ ἐκπορευτόν, εἰπέ μοι, μέσον ἀναφανὲν τῆς σῆς διαιρέσεως, καὶ παρὰ κρείσσονος ἢ κατὰ σὲ θεολόγου, τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, εἰσαγόμενον; Εἰ μὴ τὴν φωνὴν ἐκείνην τῶν σῶν ἐξελῖλες εὐαγγελίων, διὰ τὴν τρίτην σου Διαθήκην, "τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται"· ὃ καθ' ὅσον μὲν ἐκεῖθεν ἐκπορεύεται, οὐ κτίσμα· καθ' ὅσον δὲ οὐ γεννητόν, οὐχ Υἱός· καθ' ὅσον δὲ ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ μέσον Θεός. καὶ οὕτω σου τὰς τῶν συλλογισμῶν ἄρκυς διαφυγὼν θεὸς ἀναπέφηνε, τῶν σῶν διαιρέσεων ἰσχυρότερος.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

action of that divine Spirit in their own lives. The first four *Theological Orations* are intensely focused on the relationship between humanity, Christ, and salvation that define the boundaries of the Christ event, in addition to a notable comment on the role of Christ after his ascension. Running through his two orations on the Son is the importance of Christ's humanity for human salvation, which provides the context for Gregory's talk of the Spirit in *Or*. 31.[72] This sets a concern for the position of humanity after salvation; that is to say, a concern with an end state of θέωσις:

> Of his royal rule in the first sense there will be no end. Will it have an end in the second sense? Yes, when he takes us in safety under his control, why need he go on producing submission in those who have yielded it? After that submission he rises up in judgement of the earth, dividing saved and lost. After that submission "God stands in the midst of the gods" (meaning "the saved") appointing to each the particular honour, the special mansion, of which he is worthy.[73]

Salvation, in this rendering, is a state that immediately precedes an eschatological judgement. In other words, Gregory locates the fulfilment of the promise of the incarnation as something achievable, for those who will have already submitted without positing a further purgatorial state. Even after judgement, distinction is to be made between those who pursued different qualities of virtue. Casting back, there were extensive descriptions in *Or*. 14, but also in his explicit identification of peacemakers as sons of God.[74] After this, Christ is to stand as God amidst gods. It is not the work of Christ to make those gods, however, but the work of the Spirit. As Gregory put it in an often repeated turn of phrase: "If [the Spirit] is classed along with me, how can he make me God, or unite me to the Godhead [Εἰ τέτακται μετ' ἐμοῦ, πῶς ἐμὲ ποιεῖ Θεόν, ἢ πῶς συνάπτει θεότητι;]?"[75] The state of salvation into which believers are said to enter before their judgement by Christ is one brought about by the actions of the Spirit in their lives, but it is made possible through the incarnation and ultimately validated through Christ's judgement.

There is a process here: Christ offers the initial affirmation of the Spirit in Jn 15:26; the Spirit cleanses and enters into the life of the believer; and through the power of the Spirit the believer is improved in such a way that

---

[72] *Or*. 29.19, 30.2.

[73] *Or*. 30.4, trans. Wickham, 96. SC 250, 232. Τῆς μὲν οὖν ἐκείνως νοουμένης βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται πέρας. Τῆς δευτέρας δὲ τί; Τὸ λαβεῖν ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ χεῖρα καὶ σῳζομένους. Τί γὰρ δεῖ τὴν ὑποταγὴν ἐνεργεῖν ὑποτεταγμένων; Μεθ' ἣν ἀνίσταται κρίνων τὴν γῆν, καὶ διαιρῶν τὸ σῳζόμενον καὶ τὸ ἀπολλύμενον· μεθ' ἣν "ἵσταται Θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ θεῶν," τῶν σῳζομένων, διακρίνων καὶ διαστέλλων, τίνος ἕκαστος τιμῆς καὶ "μονῆς" ἄξιος. In addition to Ps 82:1, Gregory again depends on Jn 14:2.

[74] *Or*. 22.15.

[75] Or. 31.4. SC 250, 282.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

they are judged as saved by Christ. In presenting his view of Christ's advocacy, Gregory offers some clarification on their respective roles:

> Even at this moment he is, as man, making representation for my salvation, until he makes me divine by the power of his incarnate manhood. "As man" I say, because he still has with him the body he assumed, though no longer "regarded as flesh" – meaning the bodily experiences, which, sin aside, are ours and his. This is the "advocate" we have in Jesus – not a slave who falls prostrate before the Father on our behalf. Get rid of what is really a slavish suspicion, unworthy of the Spirit. It is not in God to make that demand nor in the Son to submit to it; the thought is unjust to God. No, it is by what he suffered as man that he persuades us, as Word and Encourager, to endure. That, for me, is the meaning of his "advocacy."[76]

According to Gregory, then, the Son may properly be said to contribute to human salvation – understood as making gods. As detailed in this passage, it is the Christ's incarnation that enables such change. However, the position of the Spirit is that of the believer's present paraclete, as laid out in *Or*. 41 and in *Or*. 31.4. The role of the Son is to continually advocate for the salvation of humanity, and to finally affirm his own imprint in judgement, ultimately completing deification. As already seen in *Or*. 30.4, however, while this may be the logical end-state of salvation, that is not its content for the living believer still in the process of submitting. Christ has another role, touched upon in *Or*. 41, and Gregory's earlier Constantinopolitan oration. The function of Christ's life as written is to act as a template for the salvation of the believer. In order to clarify how this functions, it is necessary to understand how Gregory conceived of the life of Christ.

The text is always Gregory's unassailable source. However, Gregory has left no systematic account of Christ's life. Whether in the form of biblical commentary or in speculation of his own, no single oration dwells on the subject at length – Gregory's concern is principally for post-resurrection activity. Although the consequences, for doctrine and for the believer, are unpacked in Gregory's writings, the simpler question of his reception of Christ's life as written in the Gospels is largely unavailable. This is the case even his 380 Christmas oration, in which Gregory asserts the soteriological import of emulating Christ's life and charged his listeners to travel through

[76] *Or*. 30.14, trans. Wickham, 104. SC 250, 256. Πρεσβεύει γὰρ ἔτι καὶ νῦν, ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας, ὅτι μετὰ τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν, οὗ προσέλαβεν, ἕως ἂν ἐμὲ ποιήσῃ Θεὸν τῇ δυνάμει τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως, κἂν μηκέτι κατὰ σάρκα γινώσκηται, τὰ σαρκικὰ λέγω πάθη καί, χωρὶς τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἡμέτερα. Οὕτω δὲ καὶ "παράκλητον ἔχομεν Ἰησοῦν," οὐχ ὡς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προκαλινδούμενον τοῦ Πατρός, καὶ προσπίπτοντα δουλικῶς. Ἄπαγε τὴν δούλην ὄντως ὑπόνοιαν, καὶ ἀναξίαν τοῦ Πνεύματος. Οὔτε γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦτο ἐπιζητεῖν, οὔτε τοῦ Υἱοῦ πάσχειν, ἢ ὡς περὶ Θεοῦ διανοεῖσθαι δίκαιον ἀλλ' οἷς πέπονθεν, ὡς ἄνθρωπος, πείθει καρτερεῖν, ὡς λόγος καὶ παραινέτης. τοῦτο νοεῖταί μοι ἡ παράκλησις.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

the life of Christ.[77] Although the task is not straightforward, it is possible to deduce from Gregory's theological assertions what elements were most significant to him. Helpfully, what is present in this regard is a summation of the acts of the incarnate Christ.[78] Such arguments have an apologetic character intended to counter the challenge of the relative importance of either Christ's divinity or humanity, which must be kept in sight.[79]

To begin with, Gregory's account of the birth of Christ in *Or.* 29 is handled separately from the narrative of Christ's life. This is a consequence of the apologetic context of his remarks, and the structure of his argument for the divinity of Christ. The birth narrative serves as a bridge between the argument concerning the generation of the Word and the acts of Christ incarnate:[80]

He was born – yet he was already begotten – of a woman. And yet she was a virgin. That it was from a woman makes it human, that she was a virgin makes it divine. On earth he has no father, but in heaven no mother. All this is part of his Godhead.[81] He was carried in the womb, but acknowledged by a prophet as yet unborn himself, who leaped for joy at the presence of the Word for whose sake he had been created.[82] He was wrapped in swaddling bands, but at the Resurrection he unloosed the swaddling bands of the grave. He was laid in a manger, but was extolled by angels, disclosed by a star, and adored by Magi.[83] Why do you take offense at what you see, instead of attending to its spiritual significance?[84] He was exiled into Egypt, but he banished the Egyptian idols.[85] He had "no form or beauty" for the Jews, but for David he was "fairer than the children of men" and on the mount he

[77] *Or.* 38.8.

[78] The incarnational and eschatological framework of deification in this respect, particularly more widely, is well summarised in Hilarion Alfeyev, "The Deification of Man in Eastern Patristic Tradition (With Special Reference to Gregory Nazianzen, Symeon the New Theologian, and Gregory Palamas," *Colloquium* 36, no. 2 (2004): 113.

[79] Beeley, *Trinity*, 179 on the "activation" of knowledge by the Spirit. The account presented here places a stronger emphasis on the action of the Spirit before this.

[80] Fulford highlights that Gregory refers to his own exegesis in terms which parallel the Antiochenes, but that Gregory's method more closely resembles that of Origen. See Ben Fulford, "Gregory of Nazianzus and Biblical Interpretation," in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (ed. Christopher Beeley; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012), 44.

[81] Mt 1:18–25.

[82] Lk 1:41.

[83] Lk 2:8–20 contains glorification by angels and a manger. Mt 2:1–12 describes the visitation of the Magi.

[84] An interesting parallel can be identified here between Gregory's admonition to focus on the signifier over the signifier here, and Origen's in *Peri archon 4.3.*15. See especially David Dawson, "Allegorical Reading and the Embodiment of the Soul in Origen," in *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric and Community* (ed. Lewis Ayres et al; London: Routledge, 1998), 30 for some of the background and implications of this interaction with linguistic duality.

[85] Mt 12:34; Jn 3:4.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

shines forth, becoming more luminous than the Sun, to reveal the future mystery.[86] As man he was baptised, but he absolved sins as God – his purpose was to sanctify the waters.[87]

Gregory's emphasis on a human and divine birth reinforces not merely Christ's divinity, but reflects important elements of baptismal practice. Christ's own baptism is given less significance, in no small part because, as Gregory says, it did not serve the purpose of a baptism but instead to make possible other baptisms. The problem of an unclean and a clean birth is solved, for Christ, in his nature. His baptism was undertaken for others. There is a repetitive formula emphasising the distinct character of these human and divine properties at work. Even so, another pattern emerges, wherein Gregory is rehearsing Christ's life. Given the goals of his argument, this is necessarily divided between human events and divine actions. Ultimately, this is an exposition not of the life of Christ the incarnate Word, but Gregory's attempt to tease apart and emphasise the two distinct – for lack of a better word – parts of that which had been, in Gregory's thought, mixed together in perfect harmony. Without their coordinating clauses concerning divinity, these lines are a straightforward presentation of Christ's life. The structure to be found in the earlier section begins to fall away when Gregory launches into the events of Christ's life proper:

As man he was put to the test, but as God he came through victorious – yes, he bids us be of good cheer, because he has conquered the world. He hungered – yet he fed thousands. He is indeed "living, heaving bread."[88] He thirsted – yet he exclaimed: "Whosoever thirsts, let him come to me and drink."[89] Indeed he promised that believers would become fountains.[90] He was tired – yet he is the "rest" of the weary and the burdened. He was overcome by heavy sleep – yet he goes lightly over the sea, rebukes winds, and relives the drowning

[86] Mt 19:24; Jn 16:15, 17:10; Jn 6:57.

[87] Or. 29.19–20, trans. Wickham, 86–87, alt. SC 250, 218–19. Ἐγεννήθη μέν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγεγέννητο· ἐκ γυναικὸς μέν, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρθένου. Τοῦτο ἀνθρώπινον, ἐκεῖνο θεῖον. Ἀπάτωρ ἐντεῦθεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀμήτωρ ἐκεῖθεν. Ὅλον τοῦτο θεότητος. Ἐκυοφορήθη μέν, ἀλλ' ἐγνώσθη προφήτῃ καὶ αὐτῷ κυοφορουμένῳ καὶ προσκιρτῶντι τοῦ Λόγου, δι' ὃν ἐγένετο. Ἐσπαργανώθη μέν, ἀλλ' ἀποσπαργανοῦται τὰ τῆς ταφῆς ἀνιστάμενος. Ἐν φάτνῃ μὲν ἀνελκίθη, ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀγγέλων ἐδοξάσθη, καὶ ὑπ' ἀστέρος ἐμηνύθη, καὶ ὑπὸ μάγων προσεκυνήθη. Πῶς σὺ προσπταίεις τῷ βλεπομένῳ, μὴ σκοπῶν τὸ νοούμενον; Ἐφυγαδεύθη μὲν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, ἀλλὰ φυγαδεύει τὰ Αἰγυπτίων. Οὐκ εἶχεν "εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος" παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις, ἀλλὰ τῷ Δαβὶδ "ὡραῖος" ἦν "κάλλει παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων," ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους ἀστράπτει, καὶ ἡλίου φωτοειδέστερος γίνεται, τὸ μέλλον μυσταγωγῶν. Ἐβαπτίσθη μὲν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἁμαρτίας ἔλυσεν ὡς Θεός, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἁγιάσῃ τὰ ὕδατα. On Christ's baptism Mt 3:14–17; Mk 1:9–11; Lk 3:21–22. Jn 1:26–36 does not mention Jesus being baptised.

[88] Mt 4:1–11 and Lk 4:1–13 on temptation. Mt 14:13–21; Mk 6:30–44; Lk 9:12–27; Jn 6:1:14 on feeding; Jn 6:1:35 on the bread of heaven.

[89] Jn 7:37.

[90] Jn 7:38.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Peter.[91] He pays tax – yet he uses a fish to do it; indeed he is emperor over those who demand the tax.[92] He is called a "Samaritan, demonically possessed" – but he rescues the man who came down from Jerusalem and fell among thieves. Yes, he is recognised by demons, drives out demons, drowns deep a legion of spirits, and sees the prince of demons falling like lightning.[93] He is stoned, yet not hit; he prays, yet he hears prayer. He weeps, yet he puts an ending to weeping. He asks where Lazarus is laid – he was a man; yet he raises Lazarus – he is God. He is stoned, but is not taken.[94] He is sold, and cheap was the price – thirty pieces of silver; yet he buys back the world at the mighty cost of his own blood.[95] A sheep, he is led to the slaughter – yet he shepherds Israel, and now the whole world as well. A lamb, he is dumb – yet he is "Word," proclaimed by "the voice of one crying in the wilderness." He is weakened, wounded – yet he cures every disease and every weakness.[96]

In composing this account of the life of Christ, Gregory's purpose was to affirm his divinity in action and possession. In doing so, he makes broad appeal to the witness of the Gospels, but in such a way that offers remarkable insights into how he conceived of the function of Christ's divinity. Gregory charged his listeners to be remade by the Spirit and, in doing so, to travel through the life of Christ. In making this case, he is not merely calling for believers to live Christ's life humanly, but also to submit perfectly to Christ as part of their affiliation to the divine. What Gregory chooses to emphasise

[91] Mt 14:22–27; Mk 6:45–52; Jn 6:19 on Jesus walking on water; Mt 14:28–33.

[92] Lk 20:19–25.

[93] Mt 8:28–34; Mk 5:1–20; Lk 8:26–39 on the legion; Jn 8:48 on being called a Samaritan and demoniac.

[94] Jn 8:59 hides himself from a stoning Jn 11:1–46 on the resurrection of Lazarus, but not asking where he was laid.

[95] Mt 26:15.

[96] Or. 29.20, trans. Wickham, 87–88, alt. SC 250, 220–22. Ἐπειράσθη ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐνίκησεν ὡς Θεός, ἀλλὰ θαρρεῖν διακελεύεται ὡς κόσμον νενικηκώς. Ἐπείνησεν, ἀλλ' ἔθρεψε χιλιάδας, ἀλλ' ἄρτος ἐστὶ ζωτικὸς καὶ οὐράνιος. Ἐδίψησεν, ἀλλ' ἐβόησεν· "Ἐάν τις διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω πρός με, καὶ πινέτω," ἀλλὰ καὶ πηγάζειν ὑπέσχετο τοὺς πιστεύοντας. Ἐκοπίασεν, ἀλλὰ τῶν κοπιώντων καὶ πεφορτισμένων ἐστὶν ἀνάπαυσις. Ἐβαρήθη μὲν ὕπνῳ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πελάγους κουφίζεται, ἀλλ' ἐπιτιμᾷ πνεύμασιν, ἀλλὰ Πέτρον κουφίζει βαπτιζόμενον. Δίδωσι τέλος, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἰχθύος, ἀλλὰ βασιλεύει τῶν ἀπαιτούντων. Σαμαρείτης ἀκούει καὶ δαιμονῶν, πλὴν σώζει τὸν ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ καταβαίνοντα καὶ λῃσταῖς περιπεσόντα, πλὴν ὑπὸ δαιμόνων ἐπιγινώσκεται, καὶ ἀπελαύνει δαίμονας, καὶ λεγεῶνα πνευμάτων βυθίζει, καὶ "ὡς ἀστραπὴν ὁρᾷ πίπτοντα" τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῶν δαιμόνων. Λιθάζεται, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἁλίσκεται. Προσεύχεται, ἀλλ' ἐπακούει. Δακρύει, ἀλλὰ παύει δάκρυον. Ἐρωτᾷ ποῦ τέθειται Λάζαρος, ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ἦν· ἀλλ' ἐγείρει Λάζαρον, Θεὸς γὰρ ἦν. Πωλεῖται, καὶ λίαν εὐώνως, τριάκοντα γὰρ ἀργυρίων, ἀλλ' ἐξαγοράζει κόσμον, καὶ μεγάλης τιμῆς, τοῦ ἰδίου γὰρ αἵματος. Ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἄγεται, ἀλλὰ ποιμαίνει τὸν Ἰσραήλ, νῦν δὲ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. Ὡς ἀμνὸς ἄφωνος, ἀλλὰ λόγος ἐστί, φωνῇ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καταγγελλόμενος. Μεμαλάκισται, καὶ τετραυμάτισται, ἀλλὰ θεραπεύει "πᾶσαν νόσον, καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν." Jn 1:1; Jn 1:23; Is 53:5; Mt 9:35.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

here is reflective of that mandate, even if it is not born directly out of it. Christ is tempted, hungers, thirsts, is wearied, tired, pays tributes, is mocked, assaulted, prays, weeps, is betrayed and wounded – all experiences that Gregory himself contended with while in Constantinople. His audience, likewise, will be familiar with many if not all of these. Christ, who bears the Spirit and represents the ideal of deification, overcomes or ameliorates all of these events. In speaking of Pentecost, Gregory told his listeners that not only was the Spirit as physically present with them as it was with Christ, it is present in the same manner, though not to the same degree as it was with Christ.[97] His listeners – perhaps not for *Or*. 31 but in his own community – are expected to travel through Christ's life and to similarly (though not identically) overcome their humanity for that in them which was divine.

> He is brought up to the tree, and nailed to it – yet by the tree of life he restores us. Yes, he saves even a thief crucified with him; he wraps all the visible world in darkness.[98] He is given vinegar to drink, gall to eat...[99] […] He surrenders his life, yet he has power to take it again. Yes, the veil is rent, for things of heaven are being revealed, rocks split, and dead men have an earlier awakening. He dies, but he vivifies, and by death destroys death. He is buried, yet he rises again. He goes down to Hades, yet he leads souls up, ascends to heaven, and will come to judge quick and dead...[100]

In view of what he will write in *Or*. 30.4 concerning Christ's judgement of the saved, Gregory's final words on Christ's life remain resonant. Just as his believers will die and eventually be judged, so too did Christ die that they could be judged as saved. The passage is ordered according to an internal logic, rather than that of its sources, but is all the more enlightening as to his conception of what is significant in the gospel story of Christ. In this case, Gregory sought to use scriptural texts to demonstrate the divinity of Christ. He returned to them when he sought to demonstrate the divinity of the Spirit. In bringing the two together, he sought to show how the salvation of the believer was simultaneously oriented towards Christ and accomplished by the

---

[97] *Or*. 41.11.

[98] Mt 27:45; Mk 15:33; Lk 23:43.

[99] Mt 27:34; Mk 15:23; Lk 23:36; Jn 19:29.

[100] *Or*. 29.20, trans. Wickham, 88. SC 250, 222. "Ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον" ἀνάγεται, προσπήγνυται, ἀλλὰ "τῷ ξύλῳ τῆς ζωῆς" ἀποκαθίστησιν, ἀλλὰ σώζει καὶ λῃστὴν συσταυρούμενον, ἀλλὰ σκοτίζει πᾶν τὸ ὁρώμενον. Ὄξος ποτίζεται, χολὴν βρωματίζεται· τίς; Ὁ τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς οἶνον μεταβαλών, ὁ τῆς πικρᾶς γεύσεως καταλυτής, ὁ "γλυκασμὸς καὶ ὅλος ἐπιθυμία." Παραδίδωσι τὴν ψυχήν, ἀλλ' ἐξουσίαν ἔχει πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν, ἀλλὰ καταπέτασμα ῥήγνυται – τὰ γὰρ ἄνω παραδείκνυται –, ἀλλὰ πέτραι σχίζονται, ἀλλὰ νεκροὶ προεγείρονται. Ἀποθνῄσκει, "ζωοποιεῖ" δέ, καὶ καταλύει τῷ θανάτῳ τὸν θάνατον. Jn 2:7–9, 10:17–18; Mt 27:51–52; Mt 27:50; Mk 15:37; Lk 23:46; Jn 19:30, 5:21. There are yet more references than those identified here, but these provide a sense of the expansive nature of the text. Wickham, *On God*, 92 provides a more complete list.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Spirit – yet also fully complete in the incarnate Christ and to be perfected in the eschaton.

III. Interrogating the Golden Chain

In moving on to *Or*. 31, the framing of Christ's life just rendered is recapitulated in order to present the action of the Spirit within it explicitly, but more succinctly. Having established the divinity of Christ in the course of his argument (as far as Gregory is concerned), he relies on his former argument to reinforce the divinity of the Spirit. In asserting this divinity, Gregory appealed to the Gospel account of Christ's life and to the actions of the Spirit: "Look at the facts: Christ is born, the Spirit is his forerunner; Christ is baptised, the Spirit leads him up; Christ performs miracles, the Spirit accompanies him; Christ ascends; the Spirit fills his place."[101] What was offered more than a reiteration of the life of Christ. It is an attempt to draw out a concurrent story about the Spirit. Gregory took this further:

> I shudder to think of the wealth titles, the mass of names, outraged by resistance to the Spirit. He is called "Spirit of God," "Spirit of Christ," "Mind of Christ," "Spirit of the Lord," [...] The Spirit it is who created and creates anew through baptism and resurrection. The Spirit it is who knows all things, who teaches all things, who blows where and as strongly as he wills, who leads, speaks sends out, separates, who is vexed, and tempted. He reveals, illumines, gives life – or rather, is absolutely Light and Life. He makes temples, he deifies, he makes us complete, he initiates us in such a way that he both precedes baptism, and is wanted after it. All that God actively performs, he performs. Divided in fiery tongues, he distributes graces. He makes Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. He is intelligent, manifold, clear, distinct, irresistible, unpolluted – or in other words, he is utterly wise, his operations are multifarious, he clarifies all things distinctly, his authority is absolute, and he is free from mutability.[102]

---

[101] *Or*. 31.29, trans. Wickham, 139, alt. SC 250, 332. Σκόπει δὲ οὕτως· γεννᾶται Χριστός, προτρέχει· βαπτίζεται, μαρτυρεῖ· πειράζεται, ἀνάγει· δυνάμεις ἐπιτελεῖ, συμπαρομαρτεῖ· ἀνέρχεται, διαδέχεται.

[102] *Or*. 31.29, trans. Wickham, 140, alt. SC 250, 332–34. Ἐγὼ μὲν φρίττω τὸν πλοῦτον ἐννοῶν τῶν κλήσεων, καὶ καθ' ὅσων ὀνομάτων ἀναισχυντοῦσιν οἱ τῷ Πνεύματι ἀντιπίπτοντες. Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ λέγεται, Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, νοῦς Χριστοῦ, Πνεῦμα Κυρίου, αὐτὸ Κύριος· […] Πνεῦμα τὸ ποιῆσαν, τὸ ἀνακτίζον διὰ βαπτίσματος, δι' ἀναστάσεως· Πνεῦμα τὸ γινῶσκον ἅπαντα, τὸ διδάσκον, τὸ πνέον ὅπου θέλει καὶ ὅσον, ὁδηγοῦν, λαλοῦν, ἀποστέλλον, ἀφορίζον, παροξυνόμενον, πειραζόμενον, ἀποκαλυπτικόν, φωτιστικόν, ζωτικόν, μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτοφῶς καὶ ζωή· ναοποιοῦν, θεοῦν, τελειοῦν, ὥστε καὶ προλαμβάνειν τὸ βάπτισμα καὶ ἐπιζητεῖσθαι μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα· ἐνεργοῦν ὅσα Θεός, μεριζόμενον ἐν γλώσσαις πυρίναις, διαιροῦν χαρίσματα, ποιοῦν ἀποστόλους, προφήτας, εὐαγγελιστάς, ποιμένας, καὶ διδασκάλους· νοερόν, πολυμερές, σαφές, τρανόν, ἀκώλυτον, ἀμόλυντον, ὅπερ ἴσον δύναται τὸ σοφώτατον καὶ πολύτροπον ταῖς ἐνεργείαις, καὶ σαφηνιστικὸν πάντων, καὶ τρανωτικόν, καὶ αὐτεξούσιον, καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον· For a development of the use of activity in Or. 31, see Alexis Torrance,

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

In listing the titles of the Spirit, Gregory points directly to the connection drawn by the Spirit between divine and human – the Spirit of God moving towards humanity and culminating in the Spirit of the fear of God. As Gregory moves from identifying that which might be ascribed to the Spirit, or his attributes, he proceeds to describe the actions of the Spirit. Among those actions, all the significant events of Christ's narrative identified in *Or.* 29.20 are repeated. The story of Christ's birth, baptism, temptation, miracles, and ascension are accompanied by the Spirit's forerunning, witness, guidance, accompaniment, and resurrecting. The believer's story is accompanied by the same actions of the Spirit, repeated here at the end of *Or.* 31.29. What the Spirit did for Christ is that which the Spirit does for humanity, in the same way that the Spirit is present and possessed as with Christ, in a manner befitting human nature. In this way, it is consistent with Gregory's stated position that "our conduct has been handed down to the extent of being a model for ours while avoiding a complete likeness."[103]

Appealing to the golden chain as the standard of Gregory's pneumatology (the progression from Spirit to Christ to God) is a faulty conclusion in view of this more complex reliance on the life of Christ as a vehicle for the orientation of the believer towards ultimate deification. Chief among its faults is that the golden chain applies only to the divinity of the Spirit, not the activity of the Spirit in the life of the believer: "If he is to be worshipped, why not adored? And if to be adored, how can he fail to be God? One links with the other, a truly golden and saving chain."[104] Though important – and as shown in many other cases in Gregory's thought, a necessary predicate of salvation – in the very next line he rendered it less significant for the believer moving towards purification: "From the Spirit comes our rebirth, and from rebirth comes a new creating, from new creating a recognition of the worth of him who effected it..."[105] The original use of the image of the golden chain, and most probably Gregory's source for the image, is instructive in this as well.

"Precedents for Palamas' Essence-Energies Theology in the Cappadocian Fathers," *VC* 63 (2009): 60–64. Also Jean Bernardi, *Le Théologien et son temps (330–390)* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996), 297 more generally.

[103] *Or.* 40.30, trans. Harrison, 125. In general this study follows along with Harrison, "Gregory of Nazianzus' Festal Orations," 47 and Hofer, *Christ*, 158–60. There is one difference with Hofer, on a point of emphasis: it is the active presence of the Spirit that enables the believer's imitation of Christ. The position of Christ, historical or transcendent, is secondary in the reality of salvation as experienced by the believer to that of the Spirit. This sentiment is reinforced in Gregory's argument in 40.30.

[104] *Or.* 31.28, trans. Wickham, 139, alt. SC 250, 332. Εἰ δὲ προσκυνητόν, πῶς οὐ σεπτόν; Εἰ δὲ σεπτόν, πῶς οὐ Θεός; Ἓν ἥρτηται τοῦ ἑνός, ἡ χρυσῆ τις ὄντως σειρὰ καὶ σωτήριος.

[105] Ibid. Καὶ παρὰ μὲν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἡμῖν ἡ ἀναγέννησις· παρὰ δὲ τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως ἡ ἀνάπλασις· παρὰ δὲ τῆς ἀναπλάσεως ἡ ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἀξίας τοῦ ἀναπλάσαντος.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

In the eighth book of the *Iliad*, Zeus addresses the gathered gods of Olympus. He says that, "Make you fast a golden chain and lay you hold thereof, all you gods and goddesses; yet you could not drag to earth from out of heaven Zeus the counsellor most high, not though you laboured sore."[106] In the *Iliad* the chain links heaven and earth, but it is not a path for progress. In Gregory the chain chiefly refers to the incapacity of the Spirit's detractors to drag him down to earth as well. There is, to some extent, an argument from knowledge and experience, informing each other but still distinct. In moving beyond just that golden chain, Gregory identified the means by which the believer undertook their progression with the Spirit, seen in *Or*. 31.29, further reinforced in *Or*. 30.14. The basic conclusions about the nature of the Spirit remain the same. The story of Christ is carried forward by the Spirit in the life of the believer. This is significant for the light it sheds on the image of salvation in the life of the believer for Gregory. This is a concept that cuts across ideas of collective church or singular individual to a real sacred space that overlays the temporal life of the believer, in order to make possible their individual purification, but in a way intimately connected to that of others.

IV. Conclusion

While Chapters 2 and 3 were focused on drawing together and demonstrating the underlying linguistic or contextual elements of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology, this chapter has seen the outworking of that doctrine the ascendancy of Gregory's Constantinopolitan episcopate. Given free reign to reclaim the city for his theological allies, and with imperial assent, the Spirit and its reformation of Gregory's congregation stand to the fore. The centrality of this ethical reworking, and of the role of the Spirit as the present agent of a practical deification in this life, has largely gone unexamined in favour of Gregory's broader arguments about the status of the Spirit, or an examination of Gregory's own position in this scheme. However, in shifting the focus outwards, towards his hearers in the church as such, it has been possible to identify several critical elements of his thought.

First, following the thread of harmony, Gregory's focus on peace-making is not merely a circumstantial necessity. On the contrary, it is an outgrowth of thought from his earliest orations. The Spirit, in purifying and perfecting humanity towards the divine, enabled the development of that which is already divine in created humanity. By accepting the Spirit, Gregory's audience were presented as becoming harmonious in their wills, rendering them more like the Trinity towards which their faith was orientated. Second, the temple-

[106] σειρὴν χρθσείην ἐξ οὐρανόθεν κρεμάσαντες πάντες τ' ἐξάπτεσθε θεοὶ πᾶσαί τε θέαιναι· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἐρύσαιτ' ἐξ οὐρανόθεν πεδίονδε Ζῆν' ὕπατος μήστωρ', οὐδ' εἰ μάλα πολλὰ κάμοιτε. Homer, *Iliad* 8.19–22, in *Homer: The Iliad* (trans. Augustus T. Murray; London: William Heinemann, 1924), 338–39, alt.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

making language came to full flower as part of an extended exegesis of Paul. Gregory conceived of the temple as the individual, and of the Spirit as the agent of its making. At the same time, the harmonisation of believers towards each other represents the association of these temples into Christ's own – the church. This leaves Gregory's ecclesiology rather different and less robust than some readings of *Or*. 2 would have it, but far more consistent with his repeated insistence that it is the individual who is saved by the Spirit.[107] Finally, these elements were found to be not merely asides, but firmly present in what are regarded as Gregory's seminal works on the Spirit and salvation – *Ors*. 41 and 31. Despite the attention given to these orations, and those around them in scholarship, these are not the most developed examples of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology. These are to be found in his later Constantinopolitan career.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

[107] *Or*. 41 especially.

Chapter 5

Salvation and the Spirit in Essence

Chapter 5 examines the final orations Gregory delivered in Constantinople and those works he prepared after his return to the episcopacy of Nazianzus, covering the period between 381 and 384. These works are especially significant for their overlap with, or hindsight of, Gregory's presidency of the Council. His theological agenda was broad, but his self-identified personal mission was to advocate the divinity and action of the Spirit in salvation. Gregory was set against by the exact groups which Basil so successfully courted with his more intellectual approach to the Spirit while striving for the see of Caesarea: those who supported the divinity of Christ, but rejected, at least broadly, the idea of the perfect equality of the Spirit with the Son and Father. While Macedonians and those who fought against the Spirit were denied access to the Council, those undecided or more moderate were present in force. This perfect equality, and the soteriological implications it had for the life of the believer, form no small part of Gregory's reflection in the period concurrent with and following his departure from Constantinople. While the works in the period of his retirement and before his death range remarkably widely, the content of his self-image is intricately bound up with Spirit-driven concepts that concerned him throughout the course of his career. In this chapter it will be shown how Gregory, building on his earliest reflections on the action of the Spirit, was bound up with the idea of salvation as a form of visible transformation. In accord with the doctrinal priority of the Spirit, Gregory set about casting his legacy not as one of defeat, but one of advocating the manifestation of the Spirit in the church and the world. The chapter is divided into three parts, beginning with Gregory's final orations in Constantinople, moving to the *De Vita Sua*, and ending with his funeral oration for Basil.

A. Holiness and the Spirit

I. The Holy Spirit is Truly Holy

Ors. 25, 26, and 37 are all delivered close together in 380 before the beginning of the Council of Constantinople. These orations mark the pinnacle of Gregory's influence in Constantinople. *Or*. 25, which was delivered on the

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

departure of Maximus the Cynic, who would later be part of a conspiracy to unseat Gregory from his episcopal see, is a masterful work of praise. *Or*. 37 is Gregory's first oration delivered in Anastasia, to the then emperor Theodosius. All these come at the end of what is generally perceived as Gregory's most productive period, marked out by the production of the *Theological Orations*. While they represent only a small section of Gregory's working life, these orations contain some of the strongest articulations of his thinking on the Spirit. Most significantly, these orations contain reflections on holiness and purification that set the tone leading forward. In Gregory's first oration of this period, he characterises the Spirit as holiness in itself, in a fashion which clarifies his earlier arguments in *Or*. 31.4 concerning the association of holiness with the Spirit. Following his betrayal by Maximus, the focus shifts to the Spirit's action in Gregory's own life. These culminated in his rather philosophical reflections on purification before the Emperor Theodosius.

Gregory's laudatory oration for Maximus is of a pair with the next oration, which followed Gregory's return from his countryside retreat after Maximus attempted to seize his episcopacy. The content of the two is necessarily at odds. The first praised the convert Maximus as a thoughtful, orthodox ally while the second lamented Gregory's poor judgement in his previously high opinion of Maximus. Between the two runs a strand of thought that has often been considered in broadly Trinitarian, but rarely specifically pneumatological, terms. However, despite such omissions, the context points towards why these ideas are a late but noteworthy part of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology. At the time of *Or*. 25, Gregory was arguably at the height of his theological and oratorical abilities, having delivered a series of powerful orations on the Trinity, and the Spirit particularly. The echoes of these successes are apparent in *Or*. 25, and along with them a concern for how the Spirit acts to propel a believer's spiritual recreation through the Spirit, in imitation of Christ incarnate. While Gregory's reflection on this is perhaps more apparent in *Or*. 26, *Or*. 25 contains an ambiguous but powerful reference:

> We should also believe that the Holy Spirit is truly holy in that there is no other like it in quality or manner and in that its holiness is not conferred but is holiness in the absolute, and in that it is not more or less nor did it begin or will it end in time. For what the Father and Son and Holy Spirit have in common is their divinity and the fact that they were not created, while for the Son and the Holy Spirit it is the fact that they are from the Father. In return, the special characteristic of the Father is his ingenerateness, of the Son his generation, and of the Holy Spirit its procession. But if seek after the means, what will you leave to them – in the words of Scripture, they alone know and are known by one another – or also for those of us who will one day receive illumination from on high?[1]

[1] *Or*. 25.16, trans. Vinson, 172. SC 284, 196–98. Ἀληθῶς ἅγιον τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· οὐδε γὰρ καὶ ἄλλο τοιοῦτον, οὐδ' οὕτως· οὐδὲ ἐκ προσθήκης ὁ ἁγιασμὸς,

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

This passage is one of a trio on the subject of the Trinity. The first two, on Father and Son, speak of how those persons of the Trinity are truly Father and Son. Beeley, in discussing these passages in full writes that Gregory "anchors the identity of each figure... in the unique role of the Father as source" and that "the equality mentioned in the opening lines itself depends on the unique identify spelled out below."[2] Likewise, Daley reads these lines as describing "a relationship of origin and issuance, of independence and dependence, contained in the Father's gift of what he primordially is: the unity *is* the Father."[3] While accurate, these interpretations only take account of the differentiation by origin. Even when the question of the Spirit's holiness is broached, while Gregory contends that greater knowledge of the means of origin was to be found in future illumination, there is clearly some knowledge to be garnered from the names of the persons. The Father is truly Father and is ingenerate. The Son is truly Son and is begotten. The Holy Spirit, on the other hand, is truly holy. While some information can be derived from the naming practice of Father and Son, ingenerate, and begotten, the pattern collapses at the Spirit. There is no immediately apparent relationship between procession and holiness, nor, pushing further, does holiness seem to contain any meaning that can reasonably be described as unique to the Spirit in Gregory's thought.[4] That is to say that the Son could be reasonably said to be as holy as the Spirit, but Gregory would have (and had previously) recoiled from the notion that the Spirit has some aspect of sonship.[5] However, it is clear that Gregory did not understand the holiness of God to be a property apart from the Holy Spirit.

Gregory does not supply his own definition that allows an easy working out of holiness. On the contrary, he leaves such a task to others: "We leave to others a careful, critical analysis of the many different senses in which 'spirit'

ἀλλ' αὐτοαγιότης, οὐδὲ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον, οὐδὲ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον, οὐδ' ἀρξάμενον χρονικῶς ἢ παυσόμενον. Κοινὸν γὰρ Πατρὶ μὲν καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, τὸ μὴ γεγονέναι καὶ ἡ θεότης· Υἱῷ δὲ καὶ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός. Ἴδιον δὲ Πατρὸς μὲν, ἡ ἀγεννησία· Υἱοῦ δὲ, ἡ γέννησις· Πνεύματος δὲ, ἡ ἔκπεμψις. Εἰ δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητεῖς, τί καταλείψεις τοῖς μόνοις γινώσκειν ἄλληλα καὶ γινώσκεσθαι ὑπ' ἀλλήλων μαρτυρομένοις ἢ καὶ ἡμῶν τοῖς ἐκεῖθεν ἐλλαμφθησομένοις ὕστερον;

[2] Beeley, *Knowledge*, 204–5.

[3] Daley, *Gregory*, 49.

[4] Gregory describes procession as part-way between generacy and ingeneracy, that is, between the Son and Father. He himself acknowledged this was a limited scope, being a sort of average. See *Or*. 31.8.

[5] Several instances of this are apparent, notably in *Ors*. 2, 10–12, and the *Theological Orations*. Although this isolation of generative characteristics is further worked out in this chapter, concepts like "Fatherhood" and "Sonship" are more comprehensible than "Holiness" as non-transferable between divine natures.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

and 'holy' are used in Scripture, with the texts that bear upon the enquiry."[6] Gregory goes on to write that the two words come together in some way that is unique in the Holy Spirit. This apparent disinterest in the biblical use is further reinforced by Gregory's own use of ἅγιος, which he applies nearly exclusively to the Spirit and those who have the things of the Spirit. Taken together with *Or*. 25.16, this makes it clear that, in Gregory's thought, there exists Holiness, inseperable from the Spirit, from which other senses of holiness derive their meaning. While it seems late in his career to explore this idea, this idea of the holy as an expression of the Spirit sits at the nexus of Gregory's earlier thought, and how he expressed his understanding of his final months in Constantinople.

Greater clarity on this problem can be found in another return to *Or*. 31. While Beeley and Daley pass over the idea of the holiness of the Spirit, Opperwall does come to grips with this part of the passage, writing: "For Gregory, the Holy Spirit is the holiness of God. He declares explicitly in Or. 25.16 that the Holy Spirit 'is holiness in the absolute (αὐτοαγιότης)'." His argument in *Or*. 31.4 is that since there is no sense in which God can be conceived without God's holiness, and since the Holy Spirit is God's holiness, the Spirit must be coeternal with Father and Son. He goes on to say of *Or*. 31.4 that it is "Gregory's argument about the Spirit as holiness."[7] The argument to which Opperwall refers to runs as follows:

> What use is imperfect deity? Or rather what is deity if it is imperfect?[8] Something is missing if it does not have Holiness, and how could it have Holiness without having the Holy Spirit? Either God's Holiness is independent of the Holy Spirit (and in that case I should like to be told what it is supposed to be) or if it is identical with the Holy Spirit, how I ask, could it fail to be from the beginning – as if it had at one time been to God's advantage to be imperfect and without his Spirit.[9]

---

[6] *Or*. 31.2, trans. Wickham, 118. SC 250, 278. καὶ ὁ λόγος δραμεῖται, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς δοξασθήσεται. Τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐπιμελῶς ἐξετάζειν καὶ διαιρεῖσθαι, ποσαχῶς ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἢ τὸ ἅγιον παρὰ τῇ θείᾳ Γραφῇ νοεῖται…

[7] Opperwall, "Holy Spirit," 133. See also Vinson, 172 for the translation that Opperwall quotes.

[8] This is an especially difficult line "Μᾶλλον δὲ τίς θεόης, εἰ μὴ τελεία; τελεία δὲ πῶς, ἢ λείπει τι πρὸς τελειωσιν;" Gallay's translation renders it similarly, "Quelle est done l'utilité d'une divinité incomplète? Ou plutôt, quelle divinité est-ce, si elle n'est pas complète?" See SC 250, 283. The use of perfection throughout is rather important, as it highlights the association between holiness, perfection, and the Spirit. Rendering these as "incomplete" rather than "not perfect" or similar seems to obscure rather than clarify.

[9] *Or*. 31.4, trans. Wickham, 119, alt. SC 250, 282. Τίς γὰρ ἀτελοῦς θεότητος ὄνησις; Μᾶλλον δὲ τίς θεότης, εἰ μὴ τελεία; Τελεία δὲ πῶς, ᾗ λείπει τι πρὸς τελείωσιν; λείπει δέ πως, μὴ ἐχούσῃ τὸ ἅγιον· ἔχοι δ' ἂν πῶς, μὴ τοῦτο ἔχουσα; Ἡ γὰρ ἄλλη τις παρὰ τοῦτο ἡ ἁγιότης, καὶ ἥτις αὕτη νοεῖται, λεγέτω τις· ἢ εἴπερ ἡ αὐτή, πῶς οὐκ "ἀπ' ἀρχῆς"; ὥσπερ ἄμεινον ὂν τῷ Θεῷ εἶναί ποτε ἀτελεῖ, καὶ δίχα

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Following this, Gregory introduced the idea of the Spirit deifying the believer (discussed in Chapters 2 and 4). Rather than questions of origin or co-eternality, the focus here specifically applies to the identification of holiness with the Spirit. Although Opperwall does identify this idea, he does not develop it any further than to support the same argument put forward by Beeley, Daley, and others.[10] This idea of the Spirit as holiness appears valid, but the idea that the Spirit is God's holiness is more difficult to reconcile with Gregory's emphasis on individuality in *Or*. 25.16. Opperwall does not work out this difficulty, as he goes on to the same question of distinction in the Godhead. Concerning *Or*. 25.16, though, he relies on Vinson, who renders αὐτοαγιότης from *Or*. 25.16 as "holiness in the absolute," rather than the more likely "holy in itself," which is supplied by Beeley, or "holiness itself," as supplied above.[11] That is to say, the identity in *Or*. 25.6 and the earlier *Or*. 31.4 is not between God and holiness, but between the Spirit and holiness completely. Gallay makes this connection as well, asserting that the divine holiness of the Spirit is the equivalent of the divine fatherhood of the Father.[12] Simply put, there is nothing holy apart from that which has something of the Spirit.

On this reading, the concepts of holiness and the Spirit are, for Gregory, interchangeable and inextricable. This barely supportable statement is invalidated by Gregory *Or*. 31.2. He admits the multiplicity of uses of holy in the Scripture. The holiness of the Spirit, then, is exactly what it is said to be doing in the Godhead: perfection. As expanded on in *Or*. 25.16, this idea of the Spirit as holiness itself leads to a conclusion that is not addressed by the interlocutors already discussed: holiness, perfection, and the Spirit are not merely inextricable, but is the perfecting part of an eternally self-completing Godhead through the Spirit. As Gregory wrote, no thing can be perfect if it does not possess the holy, a concept entirely congruent with the ideas of deification he has already presented. No thing can be truly perfect if it lacks holiness – which, in Gregory's words in *Or*. 31.4, is "something of perfection."[13] The many meanings of holiness in Scripture to which Gregory allud-

---

Πνεύματος. Εἰ μὴ "ἀπ' ἀρχῆς" ἦν, μετ' ἐμοῦ τέτακται, καὶ εἰ μικρὸν πρὸ ἐμοῦ. Χρόνῳ γὰρ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ τεμνόμεθα.

[10] Noble in particular. See Noble, "Deity," 136.

[11] Beeley, *Trinity*, 204.

[12] See Gallay, SC 250, 282–83. Gallay carries this through, suggesting that, for Gregory, the Spirit's holiness permits the confession of the Father and the Son. This would be consistent with Gregory's argument that to fail to confess the divinity of one is to reject all. Berkhof also comments on holiness more broadly. Hendrikus Berkhof, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1964), 110–12.

[13] This resembles the idea of the Spirit as undiminished giver. Gregory does not rely on this idea, largely because of moves such as this. He does allow for the idea of the gifts of

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

ed in *Or*. 31.2, and his attendant disinterest, become more explicable in this framing. The only holiness is to be found in the Spirit, and any other representation outside the Godhead could be a varied manifestation – just as Gregory acceded the different manifestations of the Holy Spirit prior to the ascension, in *Or*. 41.11. Just as the angels possess no other source of perfection than the Spirit, this is also true of the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and other holy things of the Scriptures. This strong identification of holiness with the Spirit, though only readily identified in tension with Gregory's earlier works, places it at the foundation of nearly all other doctrines. Hypothetically, God would not merely be imperfect in his understanding, but lacking in holiness – effectively defunct as a deity – were it not for the Spirit.

So, if the holiness of the Spirit is identified with purifying action, which forms the basis of Gregory's soteriological project, as already seen, the question remains of why this came so strongly to the fore at this point in his career.[14] The most obvious answer is that he was still riding on the crest of the *Theological Orations*. Concurrently, the occasion of first praising and then decrying Maximus would clearly put the question of perfection forward. In the case of *Or*. 25.16, Gregory is at once making a case for the unity of the Trinity and the adherence of his then friend to such thought, and presenting the case for a Christian convert. Maximus' story, as far as Gregory was aware at the time, was one of great redemption. Maximus' apparent conversion from Cynic to Christian was a clear statement of the inherent power of the Spirit to reform, the basis of much of Gregory's thought on the subject. This same attention to the recreative action of the Spirit is also apparent in *Or*. 26; although the focus has, obviously, turned from the false or imperfect perfection of Maximus to Gregory's own:[15]

> In any case, I have come back to you. I fled under pressure, but have returned − not under pressure, but in fact very willingly. My feet moved themselves, as the saying goes; the Spirit led me to do it, like a stream of water that must be forced to go uphill but that rushes downhill eagerly.[16]

---

the Spirit, but these seem a more or less actual indwelling. See also Cyril of Jerusalem's very literal reading of 1 Cor 6:19 as presented in Chapter 1.

[14] With respect to the wider case Gifford is making, this problematises his argument for deification as an outworking of a "soteriological union" of Christ and the believer. James Gifford, *Perichoretic Salvation: The Believer's Union with Christ as a Third Type of* Perichoresis (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 81.

[15] Bearing in mind, of course, that Gregory allows for grace as a cruelty, and the gift of the Spirit imperfectly accepted, or perhaps unmaintained, as the shortest path to the greatest sin. See Chapter 4.

[16] *Or*. 26.2, trans. Daley, 16. SC 284, 226. Πλὴν ἐπανῆλθον ὑμῖν, βίᾳ μὲν ἀποδραμών, οὐ βίᾳ δὲ προσδραμών, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάλα προθύμως, καὶ αὐτομάτοις ποσὶ, τὸ τοῦ λόγου, τοῦ Πνεύματος οὕτως ἄγοντος, καθάπερ τι ῥεῦμα, πρὸς μὲν τὸ ἄναντες βιαζόμενον, εἰς δὲ τὸ πρανὲς ἐπειγόμενον.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

The self-reflective tone of these passages, and of *Or*. 26 as a whole, plays a large part in the claim that Gregory's pneumatology is largely focused on representations of his own experience. This is demonstrably true in the case of these particular lines. Gregory has returned from a self-imposed exile after the failed coup by Maximus, with his short absence (by comparison with his previous self-imposed exiles, first to Basil's monastery and then to that of St Thecla) apparently having done little to damage his credibility. At the same time, his pneumatological reflection is laden with pessimism. He saw this Spirit as having to force him to go against his own instinct.[17] This is not an unusual image for Gregory, of the Spirit guiding him to a better path than he would have chosen himself.[18] The depth of his pessimism is highlighted most strongly in the second passage, in which he is presenting himself as not just unsure of his possession of the Spirit but the emphasis is on his own vulnerability and weakness, so apparently highlighted by his misjudgement of Maximus.[19]

The apparent personal disclosure on display here is less significant than the degree to which these examples are congruent with Gregory's portrayal of the Spirit in *Or*. 25.16. The two examples from *Or*. 26 represent a single personal example: the Spirit as realising perfection in the behaviour of the individual. Held in tension with *Or*. 26 and its representation of holiness (that is, of perfection) as a basic part of the nature of the Holy Spirit, the salvation of the individual is located as the basis of Gregory's Trinitarian doctrine.[20] The apparent profundity of this should not be overstated, however. Examples of this thinking have been apparent throughout Gregory's work, but it is largely only in this later period that the personalisation of the Spirit's action comes to the fore, as exemplified in *Or*. 31. This personalisation obfuscates rather than clarifies. Individual perfection by the Spirit was Gregory's starting point for understanding of the divine, not simply because it is the Spirit which brought the believer into knowledge, but because all perfection was inherent in the nature of the Spirit.[21]

---

[17] *Or*. 26.2. On pathos as a mirroring of the other in these passages see Stratis Papaioannou, "Gregory and the Constraint of Sameness," *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (ed. Jostein Børtnes et al; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006), 72–73.

[18] *Or*. 2 in Chapter 2 and *DVS* in the following section of this chapter.

[19] Maximus helped to orchestrate a coup against Gregory, supported by other Alexandrian bishops, in order for him to assume the see of Constantinople.

[20] Barnes, by way of Meijering on Athanasius' understanding of divine perfection, makes some valuable observations on Gregory of Nyssa that suggest a comparison with Gregory of Nazianzus on the nature of divine perfection would be valuable. Michel René Barnes, *The Power of God: Dunamis in Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology*, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 2001), 223–24; 224, n. 13.

[21] *Or*s. 25.16; 31.4.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

This is all the more apparent in one of Gregory's most significant accomplishments: his first oration delivered before Theodosius, *Or*. 37. The ideas of personal purification, and of the Spirit as perfecter, are clearly and openly stated:

> It shines without your wishing. Earn my respect by willing the good. You merit it if, being carnal, you become spiritual; if, dragged down by leaden flesh, you are furnished with wings of reason; if, while drawn down by the leaden flesh, you receive wings from reason; if you are found to be heavenly, being low made; if bound to flesh, you become beyond flesh.[22]

> Chastity is not laudable; I ask another thing of the eunuchs. Do not prostitute yourself concerning the Godhead. You have been bound to Christ, do not dishonour Christ. You are being perfected by the Spirit, do not make the Spirit your own equal.[23]

Gregory's more philosophical approach before the emperor cannot escape the pull of his most basic premise: not just the implication of the Spirit's divinity by way of its perfecting action, but the extent to which God's divinity as such is apparent from the holiness of the Spirit and the perfection of the individual. The tenses in *Or*. 37.17 are also especially instructive. The binding to Christ is in the past, the perfecting of the Spirit in the present. Although this work was more abstract in some ways than those prior to it, this is an insight into a practical aspect of Gregory's thought: the perfecting of the Spirit is not merely ongoing, but present. This does not diminish the significance of the bond to Christ, or else Gregory would not have cautioned against dishonouring him. However, to drag the Spirit to the level of the believer would be to betray the perfection that furnishes those benefits described in *Or*. 37.16, and which would earn Gregory's own respect.

II. Knowledge as Sealed and Secure

This focus on holiness brings forward the question of how this holiness, even if experienced, is to be expressed in the life of the believer. In locating this, it is possible to consider Gregory's oration from Christmas 381.[24] An example

---

[22] *Or*. 37.16. SC 318, 304. Φαίνει γὰρ κἂν μὴ βούληται. Χαρίζου μοι τὸ βούλεσθαι τὰ βελτίονα. Χαρίζῃ δὲ, ἐὰν σὰρξ γενόμενος πνευματικὸς γένῃ, ἐὰν τῇ μολίβδι τῆς σαρκὸς ἑλκόμενος πτερωθῇς ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου, ἐὰν οὐράνιος εὑρεθῇς, ταπεινὸς γεγονώς, ἐὰν σαρκὶ συνδεθεὶς ὑπὲρ σάρκα φανῇς.

[23] *Or*. 37.17. SC 318, 304. Ἐπειδὴ οὖν τὸ σωρονεῖν οὐκ ἐπαινετὸν, ἄλλο τι αἰτῶ τοὺς εὐνούχους. Μὴ πορνεύσητε περὶ θεότητα. Χριστῷ συζευχθέντες, Χριστὸν μὴ ἀτιμάσητε. Ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος τελειούμενοι, μὴ ὁμότιμον ἑαυτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα ποιήσητε. See also Or. 37.22.

[24] Salvation is a common theme throughout Gregory's oration on Matthew as well. Notable mentions occur at *Or*. 37.1, 7, and 13. Comparable to his later oration on Christmas is a persistent focus on the proffering of salvation through the incarnation of the Son but the reservation of its force to the Godhead.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

can be found in a charge that Gregory levels at his own congregation, a passage which needs to be seen in full.

> Walk uncomplainingly through all the ages and miracles of Christ, as Christ's disciple. Be purified, be circumcised, remove the veil with which you were born! Then teach in the Temple, drive out those who make a business of God! Be stoned, if this is what you must suffer – you will give the slip to those who cast stones at you, I am sure, and will escape through the midst of them as God did; for the Word cannot be touched by stones! If you are brought before Herod, remain, for the most part, silent; he will respect your silence more than the long speeches of all the others. If you are scourged, then seek out the other sufferings, too: taste gall, because of that earlier taste; drink the vinegar, seek out the spitting, accept the blows, the slaps on your face; be crowned with thorns – the harsh side of a godly life; put on the scarlet cloak, receive the reed, be reverenced by those who make a game of truth! And in the end, be crucified with him, die with him, be buried eagerly with him, so that you may also rise with him and be glorified with him and reign with him, seeing God, so far as that is attainable, and being seen by him: the one who is worshipped and glorified in a Trinity, who we pray might be revealed to us even now, as far as that is attainable in the bonds of flesh, in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be glory and power for the ages of ages.[25]

The believer participates directly in the Christ narrative so that they can be caught up in the parallel Spirit narrative that runs directly through it. The three charges that Gregory first offered strongly echo this. Purification, spiritual circumcision, and revelation of the true person through baptism sit at the head. At the end, however, are those last things which Gregory identified, that are already known to sit outside the scope of salvation. Between them lies the suffering and growth of knowledge that defines the process of purification in life. If a believer is truly on that trajectory, it is inevitable that they will encounter the Spirit through their involvement in that process through emulation of Christ.[26] While no direct reference is made to the Spirit, Gregory's earlier identification of Christ's possession of the Spirit points towards

[25] Or. 38.18, trans. Daley, 126. SC 358, 146–48. Διὰ πασῶν ὅδευσον ἀμέμπτως τῶν ἡλικιῶν Χριστοῦ καὶ δυνάμεων, ὡς Χριστοῦ μαθητής. Ἁγνίσθητι, περιτμήθητι, περιελοῦ τὸ ἀπὸ γενέσεως κάλυμμα. Μετὰ τοῦτο δίδαξον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, τοὺς θεοκαπήλους ἀπέλασον· λιθάσθητι, ἂν τοῦτο δέῃ παθεῖν· λήσῃ τοὺς βάλλοντας, εὖ οἶδα, φεύξῃ καὶ διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν, ὡς Θεός. Ὁ Λόγος γὰρ οὐ λιθάζεται. Ἂν Ἡρῴδῃ προσαχθῇς, μηδὲ ἀποκριθῇς τὰ πλείω. Αἰδεσθήσεταί σου καὶ τὴν σιωπὴν πλέον ἢ ἄλλων τοὺς μακροὺς λόγους. Ἂν φραγελλωθῇς, καὶ τὰ λειπόμενα ζήτησον. Γεῦσαι χολῆς, διὰ τὴν γεῦσιν· ὄξος ποτίσθητι, ζήτησον ἐμπτύσματα, δέξαι ῥαπίσματα, κολαφίσματα· ἀκάνθαις στεφανώθητι, τῷ τραχεῖ τοῦ κατὰ Θεὸν βίου· περιβαλοῦ τὸ κόκκινον, δέξαι κάλαμον, προσκυνήθητι παρὰ τῶν παιζόντων τὴν ἀλήθειαν· τέλος συσταυρώθητι, συννεκρώθητι, συντάφηθι προθύμως, ἵνα καὶ συναναστῇς καὶ συνδοξασθῇς καὶ συμβασιλεύσῃς, Θεὸν ὁρῶν ὅσον ἐστὶν ἐφικτὸν καὶ ὁρώμενος, τὸν ἐν Τριάδι προσκυνούμενόν τε καὶ δοξαζόμενον, ὃν καὶ νῦν τρανοῦσθαι ἡμῖν εὐχόμεθα, ὅσον ἐφικτὸν τοῖς δεσμίοις τῆς σαρκὸς, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰωνας τῶν αἰώνων.

[26] Hofer, *Christ*, 179.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

the inevitable intersection of a life in Christ and a life invested with the Spirit. The saving capacity of the Spirit is thus unavoidable for anyone on the path of purification, even if they are approaching out of apostasy. The first step, even before circumcision, is purification. Gregory goes on to explore this at length in his oration on baptism.

The connection between holiness, purification, and the Spirit is particularly apparent in two of the last orations, *Ors*. 39 and 40, composed by Gregory while in Constantinople. Their apparent focus on concepts of the Spirit that are comparatively simple, in contrast to *Ors*. 25 and 26 in particular, is a consequence of their context. Several aspects of this context need to be kept in sight when attempting to identify the underlying elements of Gregory's pneumatology in these orations. First, the time at which these were delivered was towards the close of Gregory's time in Constantinople. The orations from this immediate period are not infused with the vigour of his earlier works. Second, it is necessary to bear in mind the audience to which Gregory spoke, especially in regard to *Ors*. 39 and 40. While it is possible to make some generous assumptions about congregants which followed Gregory from Anastasia to the Church of the Holy Apostles where these were delivered, it is clear that he is not speaking to an audience which is, as he would say, far along the path of purification. Gregory addressed this directly in closing his oration when he wrote that: "This is all that may be divulged of the sacrament, and that is not forbidden to the ear of the many. The rest you shall learn within the church by the grace of the Holy Trinity; and those matters you shall conceal within yourself, sealed and secure."[27] *Or*. 39 is concerned with the baptism of Christ, and Gregory uses the occasion to speak broadly on the subject of baptism. The question of salvation arises infrequently, except in the general sense of Christ's life and the importance of baptism in it. The image of purification and a rising out of a body of sin into a higher one is strongly presented, with Gregory returning again to the figure of Zaccheus and his sycamore tree.[28] Indeed, much of the significant thought on salvation, and the attendant thinking on the imputation of holiness, comes at the end of this oration.

> Be completely purified, and you shall be pure, since God rejoices in nothing so much as in the correction and salvation of a human being, on whose behalf is all our speech, and all this Mystery. [...] [s]o that as perfect lights you may stand with the great light, and in his presence be initiated into the Mystery of light, illuminated yet more purely and clearly by the Trinity...[29]

[27] *Or*. 40.45. Elm, "Inscriptions and Conversions," 5–6.

[28] *Or*. 39.9.

[29] *Or*. 39.20, trans. Daley, 138. SC 358, 194–96. Πάντως δὲ καθάρθητε καὶ καθαίρεσθε, ὡς οὐδενὶ τοσοῦτον χαίρει Θεὸς, ὅσον ἀνθρώπου διορθώσει καὶ σωτηρίᾳ, ὑπὲρ οὗ λόγος ἅπας καὶ ἅπαν μυστήριον· ἵνα γένησθε ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Much has been said in recent scholarship about illumination in Gregory's thought, but what is apparent here is an intersection between the Trinity as light, its persons as Lights, and now the deified believer as themselves a light.[30] Although the image of illumination as a metaphor for salvation is apparent throughout Gregory's work, the degree to which Gregory internalised the motivation of salvation in God here is notable. It is placed as God's highest source of rejoicing. While the Spirit is not mentioned at this point, it is only a short while ago that Gregory contended that holiness, and purification and perfection, are located internal to the Spirit's work and being.

Gregory continually returns to the theme of baptism as the sacrament of salvation and a source of salvation.[31] As already discussed, strong intimations are made towards the Spirit's mediating not just access to knowledge of God, but to the experience of Christ's life – thus making possible participation in the broader life of the Spirit which runs through and then out of it. Gregory states this explicitly: "We shall be buried with Christ by baptism, so that we shall rise up with him; we shall descend with him, that we may also be lifted high with him; let us ascend with him, so that we may be glorified with him."[32] This is sufficiently significant that Gregory locates it near the beginning of an oration that is delivered to an uninitiated audience. When Gregory wrote of the tools given to them for the accomplishment of their salvation, which could never be taken from them, it is precisely this kind of access to which he referred.[33] While there was already a well-established basis for the role of the Spirit in baptism as an initiator into knowledge of God, note that the mediating role of the Spirit is identified earlier, and is extended beyond baptism. The function of the Spirit as initiator into knowledge of the whole Trinity has to be ever at the forefront, as it is the larger framework of these more detailed operations.

Before moving on to Gregory's first orations after his departure from Constantinople, one last point from his oration on baptism should be drawn out.

κόσμῳ, ζωτικὴ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις δύναμις, ἵνα φῶτα τέλεια τῷ μεγάλῳ φωτὶ παραστάντες καὶ τὴν ἐκεῖσε μυηθῆτε φωταγωγίαν, ἐλλαμπόμενοι τῇ Τριάδι καθαρώτερον καὶ τρανότερον…

[30] On the confluence of Christ, purification, and illumination in Gregory's thought from this period see Philippe Molac, "Purification and Holiness: A Perspective on Communion from Gregory of Nazianzus: An Approach from Discourse 40," *Scripta Theologica* 41, no. 3 (2009): 838–40.

[31] *Or*. 40.1; 6; 26; 33; 44. It is worth noting as well Gregory's inscription as a "shorter method" of salvation, particularly in contrast with his description of love of the poor as the shortest. See *Ors*. 40.46 and 43.63 respectively. Also see Elm, "Inscriptions and Conversions," 1–3.

[32] *Or*. 40.9. SC 358, 216. Συνταφῶμεν οὖν Χριστῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, ἵνα καὶ συναναστῶμεν· συγκατέλθωμεν, ἵνα καὶ συνυψωθῶμεν· συνανέλθωμεν, ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν.

[33] *Or*. 40.15.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Indeed, by baptism and proclamation the earthquake of crowds gathering – for so Scripture calls that time –; the proof is by the crowd that precedes the signs and miracles before the Gospel. Ill-will came from these, and from this hatred, and from hatred the plot and betrayal, but from this, the cross, and our great salvation. So it is for Christ, so far as we can grasp, and, perhaps, a more ineffable reason may be found.[34]

First, recall that Gregory located an earthquake at the coming of Christ and the abolition of the law.[35] That Gregory situates this second earthquake not in Christ's incarnation or crucifixion, but in his proclamation of the testament is notable. As Gregory wrote earlier, Christ's baptism was not necessary for his purification, but was undertaken so that the element of water could be purified for the baptism of others.[36] Finally, Gregory's references to "ineffable reason" and knowledge that is to be kept "sealed and secure" require some explanation.[37] Much of what Gregory has to say concerning the Spirit is not meant for immediate public consumption, as his repeated references both to Christ's silence and the mystery of salvation make clear. Another possible cause of this silence is that, around this time, Gregory suffered his defeat as the leader of the Council of Constantinople. After a bold statement of the actions of the Spirit in his early days in Constantinople, culminating in his triumphant arc of works in *Ors*. 41, 31, 25, and 26, a retreat into silence upon defeat would not be surprising. Any evidence to this effect would be found in his two orations mapping out his own life, in an effort to secure his legacy. These works, particularly the longer *DVS*, are not strongly focused on the Spirit either. However, they are strongly couched in the ideas of holiness and purification, alongside oblique references not only to the power of the Spirit but to its connection to Gregory's own mission.

[34] *Or*. 40.29. SC 358, 264–66. Ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ βαπτίσματος καὶ τοῦ κηρύγματος ὁ τῶν συντρεχόντων σεισμὸς – οὕτω γὰρ ἡ Γραφὴ καλεῖ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον –, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πλήθους ἡ τῶν σημείων ἐπίδειξις καὶ τὰ θαύματα τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ προσάγοντα. Ἐκ δὲ τούτων, ὁ φθόνος· ἐκ δὲ τούτου τὸ μῖσος· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ μίσους τὸ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς καὶ τῆς προδοσίας· ἐκ τούτου δὲ, ὁ σταυρὸς καὶ ὅσοις σεσώσμεθα. Τὰ μὲν δὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοιαῦτα καὶ οὕτως ἔχοντα, ὅσον ἡμῖν ἐφικτόν· τάχα δ' ἄν τις καὶ ἄλλος εὑρεθείη λόγος τούτων ἀπορρητότερος.

[35] *Or*. 31.25. Baghos makes a salient point that these earthquakes are not necessarily chaotic. However, the other earthquake of which Gregory had some experience is the one which lead to his brother's baptism, but also to his death in the following plague. See M. Baghos, "St Gregory the Theologian's Metanarrative of History," *Phronema* 26, 2 (2011): 65. Also *Or*. 7.15 and *Ep*. 20.

[36] *Or*. 29.19.

[37] *Ors*. 40.29; 45.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

B. Reflecting on Himself and on Basil's The Holy Spirit

I. The Spirit as Agent in the Self-Representational Poems

Gregory's lyric works were largely composed towards the end of his life and represent an expression of his mature thought, which encompasses a world of ideas, rites, and words. In light of such complexity, it is easy to accuse Gregory of false modesty when he writes, after concluding the account of his resignation speech to the bishops at Constantinople, "...I exercise simplicity of heart, origin of salvation, which alone is my whole argument [τὴν ἁπλότητα καρδίας ἀσκουμένῳ]."[38] The image Gregory presents in his longest lyric work, *DVS*, is a rendering of his life and mission, intended to justify his actions during and after the Council. Opperwall makes the claim that: "While Gregory is a deeply self-reflective author, his understanding of his life as presented in this, his most extended account of it, is only rarely couched in terms of the work of the Holy Spirit."[39] While Opperwall is correct that the number of explicit mentions of Spirit is relatively limited it, his observation overlooks the context of *DVS*, the role of the Spirit in Gregory's mature thought, and thus the implicit position of the Spirit. Just as significantly, *DVS* is a partial record. Rather than an honest self-disclosure, it is a carefully crafted tableau which can only be fully understood when located against the events of the final orations and events of Gregory's career in Constantinople.[40]

Although not explicitly structured as such, there are three identifiable sections to *DVS*. The first, comprising Gregory's early life, touches on his birth, education, and implied baptism. The second, beginning his return to

[38] *Carm*. 2.1.11.1865–68, trans. White, 148–49. The Greek text of *DVS* is also from White.

[39] See Opperwall, "Holy Spirit," 78–79.

[40] On the movement away from reading Gregory's "autobiographical" poems as "an illuminated path into the true self of the poet," see Suzanne Abrams Rebillard, "The Autobiographical *Prosopopoeia* of Gregory of Nazianzus," StPatr 47 (2010), 123–28. Rebillard is quite right in emphasising the need to bring best practice to bear and we will be following her urgings to approach Gregory's lyric works as performance oriented rather than autobiographical. See also Rebillard, "Historiography as Devotion: *Poemata de seipso*," in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (ed. Christopher Beeley; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012), 128. In re-reading a selection of Gregory's lyric works in an historiographical context she writes that, "The histor who emerges is a salvific and cosmological presence that focalizes the divine, thereby serving as an example of proper human/divine relations." Although *DVS* is more obviously lyric than historiographical as such, the self-dentity constructed therein bears a strong resemblance to that which Rebillard identifies. Also Suzanne Abrams Rebillard, "The Speech Act of Swearing: Gregory of Nazianzus's Oath in *Poema* 2.1.2 in Context," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21, 2 (2013): 177.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Cappadocia, covers his ordination, his episcopacies, and his victories against his opponents in Constantinople. The third is an examination of his withdrawal from the Council of Constantinople and his resignation of his see.[41] These come together for a single purpose: Gregory's rear-guard defense of his own mission – the demonstration of the power of the Spirit in the life of the believer. Thus, while it is a personal story, the theological motive is not just to present an ideal life. On the contrary, an effort is being made to justify his struggles for a greater end, and towards what Gregory perceived as the only source of holiness.

II. The Spirit as Inaugurator

In establishing the first arc of this narrative, Gregory interpolated elements of the biblical narrative to locate his own.[42] Although there are two accounts of Gregory's birth, only the account from *DRS* relates his mother Nonna's prayer, which echoes that of Hannah. In *DRS* it is his mother who dedicates him as a new Samuel, while in *DVS* Gregory wrote that he was offered up to God as a sacrifice and drew the comparison to Samuel himself. In both cases, the intended reference is to the dedication of Samuel's life to God in 1 Sam 1.28.[43] Though they differ in their specifics, both accounts offer an image of Gregory having been fixed as latter-day prophet and leader even before his birth.[44] There is another biblical allusion at play in *DVS* in the language of sacrifice. In the early verses of *DVS* Gregory related that Gregory the Elder,

[41] The use of "biblical" as a descriptor is not meant to diminish the conclusions drawn by Hofer on the Christomorphic character of Gregory's biography but instead seeks to expand the scope slightly to capture how much of Gregory's poetry, particularly describing his early life, also draws on Hebrew Bible texts. See Hofer, *Christ*, 71–89 in particular on self-referential works.

[42] Demoen in particular, and to a lesser degree Hofer, offer much more complete insights into the use of biblical metaphors in Gregory's self-representation. Although Demoen's conclusions are largely valid, his identification of the so-called autobiographical poems as personal disclosure for theological ends places him rather at odds with some of the arguments here. Hofer occupies a similar position, arguing for the therapeutic value of Gregory's verse. The distinction between a self-conscious writing for posterity by a deeply spiritual man and the incidental disclosure of those works without motive is not the subject at hand, however. See Kristoffel Demoen, *Pagan and Biblical Exempla* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996), 325; Hofer, *Christ*, 53.

[43] *Carm*. 2.1.11.90.

[44] Miller, in examining these two dream accounts, rightly deduces their significance as "nodal points" for Gregory's other biographical material. She errs somewhat in reading either of the pair as dedicating Gregory to "the priesthood," however. There is no evidence to support reading the "Lord's fold" as anything but a reference to the Christian community or the church in general. See Patricia Miller, *Dreams In Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 243.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

his father, is a second Abraham.[45] Gregory may have been held up by his family as a new Samuel, but in reflection on his life and in light of his description of his father, he implicitly identified himself as a new Isaac. This points toward the tension between Gregory's life as dedicated to God, and his role as a sacrifice on behalf of his father (in terms of his unwilling ordination). This allusive identification gives an idea of the many layers of identification at work in Gregory's account. The biblical narrative functions not just as scripture, but as part of the ongoing history of salvation in which individual believers are located. The entirety of biblical history is open to the believer as a source of example, emulation, and inspiration. However, the Spirit, as the engine of human engagement with the life of the Trinity, remains conspicuously absent from this account. To this point, the focus has been on Gregory's birth by the flesh. It is only in second birth that the first intimations of the Spirit appear, in light of the oration he gave on the Epiphany, where he wrote of five baptisms.[46]

Although there is a paucity of evidence concerning Gregory's own baptism, a story concerning its absence is prominently featured in *DVS*.[47] As he told it, Gregory set out recklessly from Alexandria for a classical education in Athens, pursuing his early love of literature.[48] The convoy of Aeginetan ships in which he travelled was caught in a storm, from which there was no respite. His fear was, he writes, all the greater because, "for by those murderous waters I was being kept away from the purifying waters by which we are made divine."[49] The as yet unbaptised Gregory called out to God for rescue from the storm: "Accept me a second time, the possession of those dear to you, a gift from both land and sea, consecrated by my mother's prayer and by overpowering fear."[50] In seeking to avoid the two-fold danger of both a spiritual and physical death, as he saw it, Gregory re-dedicated himself to God.[51] The storm calmed, and "[a]ll the ship's passengers and crew went on their way praising the great Christ, for they had received from God a double salva-

[45] *Carm*. 2.1.11.53.

[46] *Or*. 39.17.

[47] Winslow adopts the language of dedication in describing these events. While this is picking up on some of the language Gregory uses, the substitution of birth and baptism here is intended to highlight the implications of his mature thought in the interpretation of these verses. See Winslow, *Dynamics*, 5.

[48] *Carm*. 2.1.11.112, trans. White, 128.

[49] *Carm*. 2.1.11.164–65, trans. White, 22–23. καθαρσίων γάρ, οἷς θεούμεθ', ὑδάτων ἠλλοτριούμην ὕδασι ξενοκτόνοις.

[50] *Carm*. 2.1.11.195–99, trans. White, 24–25. σὺ δίς με λήψῃ, κτῆμα τῶν σοι τιμίων, γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης δῶρον, ἐξηγνισμένον εὐχῇ τε μητρὸς καὶ φόβοις ἐξαισίοις. σοὶ ζήσομ', εἰ φύγοιμι δισσὸν κίνδυνον. σὺ ζημιώσῃ λάτριν, εἰ προοῖό με.

[51] The story bears a strong resemblance to Paul's journey to Rome in Acts 27, although Gregory's vessel avoids shipwreck.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

tion."[52] The cessation of the storm had clear baptismal consequences; but what manner of baptism was it? In his oration on the Feast of the Epiphany, Gregory wrote of five baptisms:

> Moses baptised, but in water; and before that, in the cloud and in the sea. This was by way of figure, as Paul also realised. The Sea was a type of water; the cloud, of the Spirit, the manna, of the bread of life; the drink, of the drink given by God. John baptised, but not in the Jewish fashion, for it was not only in water, but aimed at conversion; but it was not completely spiritual, for he does not add the phrase, in the Spirit. Jesus also baptises, but in the Spirit; the Spirit is baptism's perfect completion! [...] And I know of a fourth kind of baptism: that conferred by witness and blood, by which Christ himself was baptised; it is all the more venerable than the other kinds, since it is not soiled by further stains. And I know of a fifth kind too: the baptism of tears.[53]

What Gregory intimated in the story of his travails at sea is not like the last three, but it is surely evocative of the first. Although Gregory made it clear that only baptism in the Spirit is a true baptism, all of them are effected with the Spirit. All five baptisms he describes contain the ritual elements of water or blood, and for Gregory it is through water that the Spirit makes its spiritual change in the baptised.[54] Thus, although the baptism he described in his story is not in the Spirit, it is still realised through the power of the Spirit. This marks the first irruption of the Spirit into Gregory's recounted story, and the changes he describes in himself on his arrival to Athens reinforce his arguments in *Or*. 40 – the veil of his first birth has been torn away, and passions stripped.[55]

---

[52] *Carm*. 2.1.11.205–8, trans. White, 24–25. τὸ γὰρ πλήρωμα τῆς νεὼς ἅπαν ἀπῆλθον εὐσεβοῦντες εἰς Χριστὸν μέγαν, διπλῆν λαβόντες ἐκ θεοῦ σωτηρίαν.

[53] *Or*. 39.17, trans. Daley, 136, alt. SC 358, 186–88. Ἐβάπτισε Μωϋσῆς, ἀλλ' ἐν ὕδατι· καὶ πρὸ τούτου, ἐν νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν θαλάσσῃ. Τυπικῶς δὲ τοῦτο ἦν, ὡς καὶ Παύλῳ δοκεῖ· ἡ θάλασσα, τοῦ ὕδατος· ἡ νεφέλη, τοῦ Πνεύματος· τὸ μάννα, τοῦ τῆς ζωῆς ἄρτου· τὸ πόμα, τοῦ θείου πόματος. Ἐβάπτισε καὶ Ἰωάννης, οὐκέτι μὲν Ἰουδαϊκῶς· οὐ γὰρ ἐν ὕδατι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν· οὔπω δὲ ὅλον πνευματικῶς· οὐ γὰρ προστίθησι τὸ "ἐν Πνεύματι." Βαπτίζει καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἀλλ' ἐν Πνεύματι. […] Οἶδα καὶ τέταρτον βάπτισμα, τὸ διὰ μαρτυρίου καὶ αἵματος, ὃ καὶ αὐτὸς Χριστὸς ἐβαπτίσατο, καὶ πολύ γε τῶν ἄλλων αἰδεσιμώτερον, ὅσῳ δευτέροις ῥύποις οὐ μολύνεται. Οἶδα καὶ πέμπτον ἔτι, τὸ τῶν δακρύων·

[54] *Or*. 7.15. The idea of martyrdom as an especially efficacious baptism of blood can be traced to Origen. See Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2009), 418.

[55] Although we have no record of Gregory having received a "true baptism," such as he administered in *Or*. 40, it is not unreasonable to suspect he undertook to have one before getting on another ship. For a developed analysis of Gregory's baptismal theology against wider fourth century trends, see Everett Ferguson, "Gregory's Baptismal Theology and the Alexandrian Tradition," in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (ed. Christopher Beeley; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012), 67–83.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

The conclusion of this origin story is in his time at Athens. Gregory lived a life of calm, undrawn by the racing lives of other students, and in turn drawn to higher things.[56] Compared with his earlier affair with pagan literature and abortive attempts to place it in service to Christian works, a truly changed Gregory had arrived.[57] The moment of greatest drama, and of most theological significance, was in an event mediated through the power of the Spirit. However, his departure from Athens marked not only a radical change in Gregory's life, but a change in his recounting of it. The interpolation of the Christian life with that of narrative biblical figures must nonetheless be kept in mind, as it lies beneath much of the subsequent narrative.

III. The Spirit as Jailor

Gregory's return to his family home in Cappadocia marked another turning point in his life. He had come back with the expectation of leading a life divided between philosophy and the demands of his family. This expectation was challenged almost immediately upon arriving. Having decided to cast all that he had before God he still "danced for his friends," and had to show off his rhetorical talents.[58] In this frame of mind, Gregory writes, he chose to pursue a middle way between asceticism and involvement in the world: "So I chose a middle path between solitude and involvement adopting the meditative ways of the one, the usefulness of the other."[59] Gregory charged that his father bound him in "shackles of the Spirit [πέδαις τοῦ πνεύματος]" in effecting his elevation to the priesthood.[60] Gregory was so distraught by this that, begging the forgiveness of the Spirit, he fled to Basil in Pontus.[61] These irruptions of the Spirit into Gregory's life, and early writings, are portrayed as negative. The Spirit is incomprehensible, imprisoning, and to be defied. The first of these qualities is predictable in a theologian as prone to apophasis as Gregory. The subsequent two are more puzzling and avoid ascription to immature thinking, since they appear in *DVS*.

First, it is important to reconcile Gregory's understanding of free will with his view of an ordered universe. Throughout his writings, he refers to the ordering of the universe according to the will of God. This occurs most ele-

[56] *Carm*. 2.1.11.116, 119–20.

[57] *Carm*. 2.1.11.113–14. For those interested in a later, but very explicit, example of Gregroy's effective adaptation of nominally pagan literary elements see Lucia Floridi, "The Epigrams of Gregory of Nazianzus Against Tomb Desecrators and Their Epigraphic Background," *Mnemosyne* 66, no. 1 (2013): 63.

[58] Carm. 2.1.11.274.

[59] 2.1.11.310–11, trans. White (1996), 32–33. μέσην τιν' ἦλθον ἐρημικῶν καὶ μιγάδων, τῶν μὲν τὸ σύννουν, τῶν δὲ τὸ χρηστὸν φέρων.

[60] *Carm*. 2.1.11.343, trans. White, 35–36.

[61] *Carm*. 2.1.11.347.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

gantly in *On Providence*: "But this much I do know: it is God who steers the course of this universe, the Word of God guiding here and there what his designs have placed above and below. To the world above he has granted concord and a fixed course lasting firm for ever. To the lower world he has assigned a life of change which involves many varying forms. Some part of these he has revealed to us, the other he preserves in the hidden depths of his wisdom, willing to prove empty the boast of mortal man."[62] The boast of which he writes refers to the belief that the movement of the stars guided the life and knowledge of the destiny of man, but is mediated in the individual by the Spirit. Although the world is set in motion by God, and guided by the Word, Gregory conceives of man as responsible for laying his own course. So, while there exists a plan set by the Spirit of which he remained in ignorance, Gregory's sense of imprisonment leads him to fly from it. Those chains with which the elder Gregory bound him were not of human making, but were the providential will of the Godhead, located in the Spirit.

Considering this appraisal of his return to Nazianzus, it is possible to draw a connection between Gregory's Spirit-driven view of providence and the biblical framing apparent earlier in *DVS*. Gregory's account of the supremely defining moment of his ordination is thus a testament to both the nature of salvation in his thought and the role of the Spirit in it. Having first defied providence, he returned and submitted to that same Providence – those "shackles of the Spirit." It was in willing adherence to this plan, and not to his own defiant desires, however lofty, that he could have found salvation. Such characterisation is carried through after his elevation to Sasima, return to Nazianzus, retreat from public life, and ultimately his move to Constantinople. To that particular fraught conflict, Gregory wrote, he was sent by "the grace of the Holy Spirit [Χάρις τοῦ πνεύματος]..."[63] At this point in *DVS*, Gregory interjected with a diatribe against the heretics that he went to Constantinople to oppose. His conflict with the Apollinarians, and then Maximus the Cynic, shifts into a catalogue of heresies, as well as an exposition of Gregory's sense of his own appeal, and a survey of his own beliefs. What all of this section forms, however, is the climax of a story about purification. The story of his success against his opponents also marks a false end to Gregory's story. Delivered to the providential path of his salvation by the Spirit, Gregory at last found a semblance of peace and success in his public position after being discontented with his own desires. He was in a notable

[62] *Carm*. 1.1.5.34–40, trans. Sykes, 24–25. αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε οἶδα· Θεὸς τάδε πάντα κυβερνᾷ, νωμῶν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα Θεοῦ Λόγος ὅσσα θ' ὕπερθεν, ὅσσα τ' ἔνερθεν ἔθηκε νοήμασι· τοῖς μὲν ἔδωκεν ἁρμονίην τε δρόμον τε διαρκέα ἔμπεδον αἰεὶ, τοῖς δὲ βίον στρεπτόν τε καὶ εἴδεα πολλὰ φέροντα· ὧν τὸ μὲν ἡμῖν ἔφηνε, τὸ δ' ἐν κευθμῶσι φυλάσσει ἧς σοφίης, θνητοῦ δ' ἐθέλει κενὸν εὖχος ἐλέγχειν. See also *Ors*. 16.5 and 18.34.

[63] *Carm*. 2.1.11.592, trans. White, 52–53.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

position of authority, secured by his own ability, and fitting to his image of the aristocrat-ascetic, who is at once at a remove and setting an example to believers.[64]

IV. The Spirit as Guide

The final part of Gregory's poem is primarily defined by his leadership of the Council of Constantinople in 381. In *DVS,* it is also where previous two features, biblical lyric and an individual Spirit-guided salvation, are brought together in the collapse of Gregory's ministry and his ultimate inability to defend his view of the divinity of the Spirit. The arc of these events begins well enough. Gregory was installed in the Church of the Holy Apostles "'through me [Emperor Theodosius] to you [Gregory] [δι'ἡμῶν σοί]...'"[65] Though a coup for Gregory, his installation was contested and he wrote: "you [Christ] who summon to suffering those for whom you suffered, just as you were then the one leading me in my hardship, be now my comforter in my sorrows."[66] These verses encapsulate the drama of salvation and bring together the two points examined earlier: biblical self-representation and a Spirit-driven providential path to salvation. Here it is Christ that summons to suffering, leads, and comforts. Willing submission to the Spirit, beginning in baptism, enables engagement through the Spirit within an ongoing biblical narrative that, on an individual providential course, moves towards its culmination in Christ.[67] This transformative, participatory movement finds its ultimate end in the temporal emulation of, and the ontological transformation towards, the figure of the incarnate Word in θέωσις. Although Christ is the end point, it is

[64] Although perhaps somewhat broad in its attribution of such thinking to the Cappadocians as a whole, Tsamis' articulation of the importance of ascent as a function of deification is useful here. Dimitrios Tsamis, *The Dialectical Character of the Teaching of Gregory the Theologian* (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1969), 153–59.

[65] *Carm*. 2.1.11.1310–12, trans. White, 106–7. The significance of this event is easily lost on a modern reader. Not only was the church previously held by Arians, but it was second in scale only to the Great Church.

[66] *Carm*. 2.1.11.1322–24, trans. White, 108–9. ὃς οἷς πέπονθας εἰς τὸ πάσχειν ἐκκαλῇ, σὺ καὶ τότ' ἦσθα τῶν ἐμῶν πόνων βραβεύς, καὶ νῦν γενοῦ μοι τῶν κακῶν παρήγορος…

[67] The location of Christ as the end-point of this movement does not, however, preclude the dependence of Gregory's Christology on his pneumatology, a point made well by Beeley. See Beeley, *Knowledge*, 179. Hofer has argued against this, on the basis of Gregory's order of theology and on wider historical trends, but in the first case this reads the metaphor of the order of theology as doctrinal rather than soteriological and in the second somewhat assumes the nature of those trends. See Hofer, *Christ*, 191, n. 196. He appeals to Opperwall's ecclesiological reading of Nazianzus' pneumatology as an alternative. However, Opperwall also struggles with the soteriological dimensions highlighted by Beeley, reading theology as doctrine more often than warranted and understating the significance of the association of Spirit and θέωσις. See Opperwall, "Holy Spirit," 52.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

the action of the Spirit along this path that manifests the salvation of the individual believer. The Spirit thus operated as the agent of theology for Gregory.[68] Even though the emphasis shifts away from the Spirit, its ongoing role points towards the significance of the Spirit. Human access to Christ is gated by the action of the Spirit. That the Word is, to put it bluntly, more important to Gregory's view of the completion of salvation is correct. If it were not so, there would be no need to examine what lies beneath to uncover the action of the Spirit. That action is no less significant for its enabling, participatory, and localised nature. Simply put, although much of the content of salvation is bound up in Christ, its actualisation is found by the Spirit.

The immediate aftermath of Gregory's appointment to the Church of the Holy Apostles is presented as a kind of instructive failure. Following on from the triumph of his appointment, he was selected to chair the Council of Constantinople. The calling of the council would result in Gregory's withdrawal after he failed to convince the council to support a declaration of the Spirit's divinity.[69] Gregory stepped down amidst opposition from other bishops:

> …so much for that! The sweet and pure spring of our ancient faith, which had merged the sacred nature of the Trinity into one (as had been worked out some time ago at Nicaea), this spring I saw being tragically polluted by the briny influx of those of dubious beliefs, those who believed whatever was approved by authority. They sat on the fence, and that was acceptable as long as they did not openly join the opposition.[70]

Gregory had again been repelled by political motives. Against the growing opposition to his leadership of the Council and the intent to unseat him on the basis of a supposedly illegal transference of see, Gregory retired not only from the council, but also from Constantinople. Despite this apparent anti-climax and the derailing of the providential, Spirit-driven work that he

---

[68] The language of theology has an extensive history in the study of Nazianzus dating to his earliest interlocutors. See Maximus the Confessor, *Ambiguum*. The interpretation of θεολογία as either a general reference to study or teaching about God or as a soteriological term is freighted. Beeley currently offers the most well developed treatment of Gregory's use. See Beeley, *Knowledge*, 196–97. *Or*. 31.26 is a seminal example of theology serving to indicate inward facing knowledge of the Godhead and the soteriological capacity of that knowledge. It is instructive to consider the wider context of the subject, and on this two of the most interesting accounts are to be found in Christoph Markschies, *Christian Theology and its Institutions in the Early Roman Empire: Prolegomena to a History of Early Christian Theology* (trans. W. Coppins; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2015); and in a more focused sense in Josef Lössl, "Theology as academic discourse," *Journal for Late Antique Religion and Culture* 10 (2015): 38–72.

[69] *Carm*. 2.1.11.1680.

[70] *Carm*. 2.1.11.1703–11, trans. White, 134–35. Κἀκεῖνο δ' οἷον· τὴν γλυκεῖαν καὶ καλὴν πηγὴν παλαιᾶς πίστεως, ἣ τριάδος εἰς ἓν συνῆγε τὴν σεβάσμιον φύσιν, ἧς ἦν ποθ' ἡ Νικαία φροντιστήριον, ταύτην ἑώρων ἁλμυραῖς ἐπιρροαῖς τῶν ἀμφιδόξων ἀθλίως θολουμένην, οἳ ταῦτα δοξάζουσιν, οἷς χαίρει κράτος, μέσοι μὲν ὄντες – ἀσμενιστὸν δ' εἰ μέσοι καὶ μὴ προδήλως κλήσεως ἐναντίας…

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

seemed to have found, Gregory regarded himself as both victorious and defeated: "My account is at an end: here stand I, a living corpse, beaten and yet – amazingly – victorious, for I have God and friends who are filled with God instead of a throne and insubstantial acclaim."[71] Clarification of this is found at the end of *DVS*: "But what shall I give the churches? My tears. For God has led me to this point, after letting my life roll through many vicissitudes; where will it end? Tell me, Word of God. I pray that it will end up in the unshakeable home where lives the bright union of my Trinity, by whose faint reflection we are now raised up."[72] Although the account of DVS was ended, Gregory was still on the path towards what he reveals clearly as θεώσις.[73] However, the reader is left with a sense of uncertainty. What Gregory proffered could not be a complete narrative, simply because he did not know how it ended. What is made clear is that, in its providential nature and its God-driven movements, this account is one of an individual's hope for salvation.

The lyric representation of Gregory's life in *DVS* is defined by its soteriological content. From the first arc, in which Gregory's entries into the world are framed in biblical imagery and baptismal language, to the second with its taut contrasts between personal desire and the providential direction of the Spirit, and finally in the third, in which these are collapsed into a narrative arc pointed at Christ and the hope of salvation, the text is a representation of the salvation history of an individual. This reveals the shape of salvation for

[71] *Carm*. 2.1.11.1919–22, trans. White, 152–53. Πέρας λόγου· πάρειμι νεκρὸς ἔμπνοος. ἡττημένος – τοῦ θαύματος – στεφηφόρος, ἔχων θεόν τε καὶ φίλους τοὺς ἐνθέους ἀντὶ θρόνων τε καὶ κενοῦ φρυάγματος.

[72] *Carm*. 2.1.11.1943–99, trans. White, 152–53. ἐκκλησίαις δὲ τί δώσομεν τὸ δάκρυον. εἰς τοῦτο γάρ με καὶ συνήγαγεν θεός πολλαῖς ἑλίσσων τὴν ἐμὴν ζωὴν στροφαῖς – ἢ ποῖ προβήσετ'; εἰπέ μοι, θεοῦ λόγε· εἰς τὴν ἄσειστον εὔχομαι κατοικίαν, ἔνθα τριάς μου καὶ τὸ σύγκρατον σέλας, ἧς νῦν ἀμυδρῶς ταῖς σκιαῖς ὑψούμεθα. The importance of this phrase can hardly be understated in later reception of Nazianzus and his language, directly or through later interlocutors. Their connection in Orthodox theology with θέωσις is especially strong, with a particularly evocative reference made by Chryssavgis, "Tears are the closest companion of deification, and the surest escape route from death to life." See John Chryssavgis, "The Spiritual Way," in *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Theology* (ed. Mary Cunningham et al; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 154. This retrospective association, particularly in light of Gregory's own extensive commentary on the importance of suffering, should not introduce a novel interpretation. Instead, a surer association is made between Gregory's tears and the true baptism, which has an earlier precedent in Clement's idea of baptism by tears: *Quis Dives Salvetur* 42. See also Alexis Torrance, *Repentance in Late Antiquity: Eastern Asceticism and the Framing of the Chrisitan Life c.400–650 CE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 77.

[73] This should not be construed as an argument for θέωσις as an end. Winslow is correct in asserting that "[t]he past, present, and future, therefore, inform each other, lending to Gregory's understanding of θέωσις a more fluid quality than has generally been recognized." Winslow, *Dynamics*, 191–92.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Gregory: an ordained movement towards θέωσις obtained in baptism, but which finds its ultimate realisation after death.[74] The influence of the Spirit is felt throughout. Although commonly, and readily, identified with baptism, and thus with the baptisms which front *DVS*, this is not a momentary irruption but a holiness brought about by the Spirit. The Spirit engages with the baptised as part of a progressive development. As shown in preceding chapters, in Gregory's thought this progressive development is defined in no small part by a biblical context. As a result, the Spirit was inextricable from hermeneutical method. From this, the Spirit became the agent of theology in every sense. Whether in the doing of theology or in the progressive knowledge of God, the Spirit is inseperable.

While the importance of the Spirit to salvation in Gregory's thought is apparent at this point – it being one of his foundational arguments in *Or*. 31 – the Spirit is riven through all else. This was expressed in the lyric of *DVS*, with the pervasive influence of the Spirit: not just in an abstract, vaguely beneficiary role outside of acting as an inaugurator of deification in baptism. The Spirit operates in a manner that continuously reshapes the believer in an ongoing, progressive purification. This is the earthquake which Gregory felt could no longer be concealed. It is, however, also the thing which caused him to lose his position in Constantinople to political manoeuvring, and whose greatest defense he mounted at the start of his career at Constantinople. These final works of that period are less powerfully pneumatological precisely because, as he saw it, a council had just been concluded which held views that did not cohere with his own; and whose content had primarily been, again, about securing the nature of Christ, and only later came to be seen as definitive for the Spirit. Thus, it is not unreasonable that Gregory's attempt to recapitulate his defeat is less focused on the Spirit than it was on Christ. On the contrary, that it is still as powerfully concerned with how the Spirit guided and changed him is a testament to Gregory's own investment in these ideas. The works produced after Gregory departed Constantinople are more unevenly concerned with the Spirit, although the absences are as instructive as the appearances for the development of his soteriological pneumatology.

[74] On this point it is necessary, to a certain extent, to part ways from Winslow. It is testimony to the quality of *Dynamics* that so many modern scholars still overlook the eschatological culmination of θέωσις and the importance of imitation in Gregory's soteriological thought. See Winslow, *Dynamics*, 156–57. However, Winslow's underdevelopment of the Spirit and the category of imitation leave the question of Gregory's views of the Spirit's economic action in effecting human salvation obscured. On the category of imitation in Gregory, see Hofer, *Christ*, 44–45. See also Gregory's statement to this effect in *Carm*. 2.1.12.1–3.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

C. The Spirit as Glorifier, Illuminator, Purifier, Deifier, but not Saviour

I. The Spirit as the Agent of Human Good

When compared with *DVS* and *DRS*, a resurgence of strongly pneumatological language is marked in Gregory's compositions after Constantinople. His *Ors*. 42 and 43, composed towards the end of 381, and in the case of *Or*. 43 delivered at the beginning of 382 in Cappadocia, suggest no such diminishment in Gregory's focus on salvation. His valedictory oration, supposedly a record of that which he delivered to the delegates of the Council of Constantinople upon his departure as president, is struck through with it. The theology of this piece is not, however, particularly constructive. Even under the assumption that Gregory presents an honest recounting, its preparation for publication was a rear-guard action intended to defend his reputation whether in the eyes of the imperial court, his contemporaries, or of posterity. Throughout his speech to the Council, salvation is defined in terms of those who possess it, or do not; those who pursue it, or do not; and those who value it, or do not.[75] This refrain continues in the opening of his panegyric for Basil, composed around the same time. *Or*. 43 was quite distinct from those funeral orations that came earlier in Gregory's life. Notably, it was delivered three years after Basil's death, and to his congregation. In every case, however, and in the poems that Gregory composed in the years around this period, there remains a consistent undercurrent emphasising the importance of the Spirit not just to salvation, but to the life of the believer.

Gregory's valedictory oration, although intended as an account of the final speech he delivered to the delegates at the Council of Constantinople, was at least formally composed after his departure. Whether or not it is a strictly true recounting is somewhat beyond the scope of its relevance here, alongside being effectively unverifiable. There is, however, one very good reason to think that it is a more or less accurate recounting: the difference in the pneumatological content of *DVS* is palpable. That particular poem, while grounded in Gregory's thinking on the Spirit, lacks the immediate, bold, and biblically-charged testimony of *Or*. 42. An early section, presented below at length, shows the extent of this:

> What do you make of our exile, and what fruit do you think has come of it – or better, what is the fruit of the Spirit within us [Gal 5:26, 2 Tim 1:14], by whom we are always stirred [Acts 17:28], and remain stirred even now? For we do not desire to possess anything as our own, and perhaps we have nothing to claim. [...] Paul, too, shared his Gospel with the Apostles [Gal 2:2], not in a spirit of competition, as he makes clear in what he writes about himself – for the Spirit keeps far away from competitiveness – but so that what was correct

[75] *Or*. 42.2; 8; 14; 18.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

might be confirmed, and what was defective might be corrected, if indeed anything of that kind could be discovered in what he was saying and doing. For "the spirits of the prophet are subject to the prophets [1 Cor 14:32]," according to the good ordering of the Spirit, who manages and distributes all things for the best. And if Paul gave his account privately and only before a few, but I do so publicly and before all, do not let that surprise you. For I crave, even more than he did, to be free from the accusations that in some way I seem to have failed in my duty, "else somehow I should be running or had run in vain [Gal 2:2]."[76]

Gregory's apparently conciliatory tone in the first lines of this passage is somewhat misleading. This is not to be a polite withdrawal in the face of opposition, something which becomes apparent when Gregory unleashes a battery of allusions to Paul's epistles and to Acts. He identified himself as a fellow-traveller, a term which is potentially ambiguous. He could either be identifying himself with the other bishops or, as Bernardi argues, highlighting the use of his translation from Nazianzus to Constantinople to unseat him from the presidency.[77] The latter interpretation gains immediate force when Gregory invokes, again alluding to Paul, the fruit of his displacement. Gregory establishes a complex allusion: the fruit of his displacement is that the Spirit might be known, but most significantly that the fruit of the Spirit can be attained by those who receive it. At the same time, his justification for being there at all is the willing of the Spirit – something he also alluded to in *DVS*, in which he is sent to Constantinople by and for the Spirit.[78] Gregory went on to question whether or not his audience was even capable of understanding what it was he was saying. This reference, again, resonates not just with his repeated claims that he never desired the see of Constantinople but reflects that, in attempting to proclaim not just the divinity of the Spirit but the consequences of that divinity, he had come to be dispossessed. Continu-

[76] *Or*. 42.1, trans. Daley, 139–40. SC 384, 48–50. ὡραῖοι δὲ τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς οἷς εἰς καιρὸν ἐληλύθατε, οὐχ ἵνα πρόβατον πλανώμενον ἐπιστρέψητε, ἀλλ' ἵνα ποιμένα συνέκδημον ἐπισκέψησθε; Πῶς τὰ τῆς ἐκδημίας ὑμῖν ἔχει τῆς ἡμετέρας; καὶ τίς ὁ ταύτης καρπὸς, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν Πνεύματος, ᾧ κινούμεθά τε ἀεὶ καὶ νῦν κεκινήμεθα, μηδὲν ἴδιον ἔχειν ἐπιθυμοῦντες, μήτ' ἴσως ἔχοντες; […] ἐπεὶ καὶ Παῦλος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐκοινοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, οὐχ ἵνα φιλοτιμήσηται – πόῤῥω γὰρ τὸ Πνεῦμα πάσης φιλοτιμίας –, ἀλλ' ἵν' ἢ βεβαιωθῇ τὸ κατορθούμενον ἢ διορθωθῇ τὸ ὑστερούμενον, εἰ ἄρα τι καὶ τοιοῦτον ἦν ἐν τοῖς ὑπ' ἐκείνου λεγομένοις ἢ πραττομένοις, ὡς αὐτὸς παραδηλοῖ περὶ ἑαυ τοῦ γράφων· ἐπειδὴ καὶ πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται, κατὰ τὴν εὐταξίαν τοῦ πάντα καλῶς οἰκονομοῦντος καὶ διαιροῦντος Πνεύματος. Εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖνος μὲν ἰδίᾳ καί τισιν, ἐγὼ δὲ δημοσίᾳ καὶ πᾶσιν ὑπέχω λόγον, μηδὲν θαυμάσητε. Καὶ γὰρ χρῄζω μᾶλλον ὠφεληθῆναι τῇ τῶν ἐλέγχων ἐλευθερίᾳ ἅπερ ἐκεῖνος, εἴ τι φαινοίμην ἐλλείπων τοῦ δέοντος, μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλως ἀπολογήσασθαι ἢ ἐν εἰδόσι τοὺς λόγους ποιούμενον. Given the density of allusion in this text, and their significance for interpretation, they are noted in line.

[77] See SC 384, 49, n. 3.

[78] *Carm*. 2.1.11.592.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

ing his emphasis on the change in behaviour brought about by the Spirit (which was apparently in contraposition to his opponents' judgements), not only with charity but with the same Spirit possessed by Paul – absent of ostentation but for the correction of error and the establishment of success. That this is not merely a platitude is reinforced even further as he continued in establishing that this Spirit had command over those of the prophets, and divides and regulates all.

Although the question of whether or not *Or*. 42 was an accurate recounting or a later construction might alter the weight given to this emphasis on the Spirit's action, sufficient connections exist with *DVS* to offer some possibilities.[79] Gregory either sublimated his pneumatology to the other concerns of driving *DVS,* and re-emphasised them with the benefit of greater time; or his departure was properly marked by an emphasis on the Spirit – understandable given the reasons (or perhaps the excuse) for his removal. Either way, these concerns were clearly at hand, and point towards not merely the ongoing importance of the Spirit and its holiness, but how to conceive of its place in his later thought. Gregory went on to emphasise the soteriological consequences of his concerns, and to invoke the images of the temple that defined his early period in Constantinople:

> You count your tens of thousands, but God counts those who will be saved; you the immeasurable grains of sand, but I the vessels of election. Nothing is so magnificent in God's sight as a purified reason and a soul made perfect by the doctrines of truth. One cannot offer anything to God that is worthy of the one who created all things, from whom are all things, and to whom are all things – surely not the work of a single hand or a single person's wealth, but not even if one should wish to honour him by bringing together all human wealth and all human handiwork. "Do I not fill heaven and earth?," says the Lord. "What house will you build for me? What shall be my place of rest?"[80]

The individual as the temple, and the perfected individuals brought together to form the church are identified together not just as the place of rest but, explicitly in Gregory's thought, as those in a state of salvation and acting as

[79] With the same caveats and cautions urged by Abrams Rebillard for Gregory's self-representational works in mind. See Abrams Rebillard, "Speech Act," 206–7.

[80] *Or*. 42.8, trans. Daley, 144, alt. SC 384, 68. Σὺ μὲν ἀριθμεῖς τὰς μυριάδας, Θεὸς δὲ τοὺς σωζομένους, καὶ σὺ μὲν τὸν ἀμέτρητον χοῦν, ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ σκεύη τῆς ἐκλογῆς. Οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτω Θεῷ μεγαλοπρεπὲς ὡς λόγος κεκαθαρμένος καὶ ψυχὴ τε λεία τοῖς τῆς ἀληθείας δόγμασιν. Ἄξιον μὲν γὰρ οὐδέν ἐστι τοῦ τὰ πάντα πεποιηκότος καὶ παρ' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ εἰς ὃν τὰ πάντα δοῦναι Θεῷ καὶ προσενεγκεῖν· μὴ ὅτι μιᾶς χειρὸς ἔργον ἢ περιουσίας, ἀλλ' οὐδ' εἰ πᾶσάν τις τὴν ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐπορίαν ἢ χεῖρα εἰς ἓν συνενεγκὼν τιμῆσαι θελήσειεν. Οὐχὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν ἐγὼ πληρῶ; λέγει Κύριος· καὶ, Ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι; ἢ τίς τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου; Notable referents in 1 Cor 8:6, Jer 23:24, and Isa 66:1, respectively.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

vessels of election. They are not saved, but prepared; not elect, but fulfilled.[81] Ultimately, Gregory located not just theological perfection but the philosophical ideal of moderation in the worship of the Trinity:

> But we walk the middle, royal road, where the experts tell us the pursuit of virtue is to be found; we believe in Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, beings of the same substance, and the same glory, in whom baptism reaches its perfection by word and deed (as anyone who is initiated knows), since it is a denial of atheism, and an admission of divinity.[82]

Gregory finally returned to the image of baptism with a nod towards the initiated: an odd choice to an audience of bishops, perhaps, except that this reinforces Gregory's understanding of the action of the Spirit. The Trinity is perfected in baptism in that, properly understood, it is undertaken with the knowledge of the divinity of the Spirit. As Gregory argued earlier, anything less could not properly be called a baptism. At the same time, this baptism perfects the individual. Ultimately, then, the perfection of doctrine relies on the Spirit just as much as the perfection of the individual. The pursuit or lack of this perfection leads directly to Gregory's funeral oration for Basil. Although he was not a supporter of Gregory's strong position when raised to the see of Caesarea, as shown by the analysis in Chapter 3, the funeral oration was an opportunity for Gregory to not merely vindicate Basil, but to reconcile himself and his own thought on the Spirit with that of his friend.[83] Even more so, it became an opportunity to reflect on how the Spirit acted in his friend, imparting a holiness that led directly to the composition of Basil's *DSS*.

II. Vindicating Basil's Soteriological Pneumatology

This refrain continues in the opening of his panegyric for Basil, composed around the same time. While Gregory's earlier funeral orations were suffused with suffering, his oration for Basil is radiant with a sense of completion. In praising his old friend to Basil's former congregation in Caesarea, he hailed the advantages of an education which concerns itself with "salvation and the

[81] As Abrams Rebillard highlighted, the spiritualisation of the body is a preparatory for salvation, but remains a barrier in life. See Suzanne Abrams Rebillard, "Speaking for Salvation: Gregory of Nazianzus as Poet and Priest in His Autobiographical Poems" PhD Thesis (Brown University, 2003), 145.

[82] *Or*. 42.16, trans. Daley, alt. SC 384, 82–84. Αὐτοὶ δὲ τὴν μέσην βαδίζοντες καὶ βασιλικὴν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἔστηκεν, ὡς δοκεῖ τοῖς ταῦτα δεινοῖς, πιστεύομεν εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ὁμοούσιά τε καὶ ὁμόδοξα, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα τὴν τελείωσιν ἔχει, ἔν τε ὀνόμασι καὶ πράγμασιν – οἶδας ὁ μυηθείς –, ἄρνησις ὂν ἀθείας, καὶ ὁμολογία θεότητος.

[83] Even apart from Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto*, his letters illustrate an impassioned defence of the Spirit against ongoing opposition in the later years of his life. On this see Michael Haykin, "And Who Is the Spirit? Basil of Caesarea's Letters to the Church at Tarsus," *VC* 41, no. 4 (1987): 377–79.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

beauty of contemplation [σωτηρίας καὶ τοῦ κάλλους τῶν νοουμένων]..."[84] In extolling the fulfilment of this quality in his friend, he praised him as a beacon of salvation to his congregants and a defender of true doctrine.[85] While this adds some further texture, something even more surprising comes later when Gregory wrote the following of Basil:

> He proved this in the discourse he wrote on the subject, in which his pen moved as if it were the Spirit's own. But he delayed telling the proper name, begging a favour from the Spirit himself and his loyal coadjutors not to be discontented with this economy, nor, by clinging to a single expression, to have ruined all by insatiable desire, at a time piety was being swept away. There was no loss to them from a small exchange of phrases, or in being taught the truth in other words: for our salvation is not in what is said, as much as in deeds.[86]

Although this adds little to a direct understanding of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology, it does show that Gregory did not, at least in hindsight, consider the problem of naming a particularly significant, except as a complication. The analysis presented in Chapter 3 is consistent with this, suggesting that this oration may not be an after-the-fact revision as much as an exposition. As Gregory wrote here, actions count more than words. While this could be interpreted as a reference to the good works Basil undertook, or his eventual writing of *DSS*, it also points towards the importance of the deeds, that is to say, operation, of the Spirit in the life of the believer, which was so significant for Gregory in 372 to 373.

Two sidelong references in particular are worth singling out. While the loyal champion of the Spirit referred to Gregory himself, the degree to which Gregory also granted Basil access to that category is remarkable to an extent which is also suggestive for the interiority of salvation to the Spirit, and to the activity of the Spirit in the life of the believer. Gregory declared the Spirit God earlier than Basil did, defended it on the grounds of experience in the economy, and did so consistently throughout his career. However, he elevated Basil's prose not merely as Spirit-inspired or guided, a claim which he attached to himself with some regularity, but as that *of the Spirit*. At the same time, Basil was seen as asking for a stay of judgement directly from the Spirit. In praising Basil, and at last publicly vindicating his stance on the divinity

---

[84] *Or*. 43.11. SC 384, 138.

[85] *Or*. 43.40; 43.

[86] *Or*. 43.68. SC 384, 278. Δηλώσει δὲ καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν περὶ τούτου συνέγραψε, κινῶν τὴν γραφίδα ὡς ἐκ πυξίδος τοῦ Πνεύματος· τὴν δὲ κυρίαν φωνὴν τέως ὑπερετίθετο, παρά τε τοῦ Πνεύματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν γνησίων τούτου συναγωνιστῶν χάριν αἰτῶν τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ μὴ δυσχεραίνειν μηδὲ μιᾶς ἀντεχομένους φωνῆς τὸ πᾶν ἀπολέσαι δι' ἀπληστίαν, τῷ καιρῷ παρασυρείσης τῆς εὐσεβείας. Αὐτοῖς μὲν γὰρ οὐδεμίαν εἶναι ζημίαν, ὑπαλλαττομένων μικρὸν τῶν λέξεων καὶ φωναῖς ἄλλαις τὸ ἴσον διδασκομένοις· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν ῥήμασιν ἡμῖν εἶναι τὴν σωτηρίαν μᾶλλον ἢ πράγμασι·

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

of the Spirit, Gregory not only shows the degree to which the Spirit intersects the life of the believer, but offers a grand validation.[87] The last line is a vindication not just of Basil, but of Gregory as well. For one who had self-proclaimed as a champion of the Spirit long before, and who had written and spoken extensively on the subject, he decided to depart the Council rather than spend more words. Ultimately, it was his actions in pursuit of his own salvation, guided by and in the Spirit, which he placed as his foremost concern.

[87] For a rich comparison of the pneumatologies of Basil and Gregory see Claudio Moreschini, "Aspetti della Pneumatologia in Gregorio Nazianzeno e Basilio," in *Basilio di Caesarea: La sua età, la sua opera e il basilianesimo in Sicilia*, vol. 1 (Messine: Centro di studi umanistci, 1983), 567–78, but especially 568.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Conclusion

This study has covered nearly the entirety of Gregory's career in seeking to illuminate a clearly defined area of thought: his soteriological pneumatology. Elements of it have been elucidated by other works concerning Gregory's theology in an effort to demonstrate not only that the Spirit's operation in salvation developed over the curse of Gregory's career, but that this development was part of a coherent theological programme. Chapter 1 set the groundwork for this inquiry, establishing a series of largely contrasting examples of earlier figures which nevertheless demonstrated that soteriological pneumatology was a persistent undercurrent in the trajectories of the fourth century. This chapter also demonstrated that the framework of Gregory's thought was such that a coherent soteriological pneumatology, which allowed for the distinct operation of the Spirit, was not only possible, but also logically consistent. Chapter 2 built on this point, interrogating the technical language that has often served as the starting point for inquiries into Gregory. By considering how Gregory's metaphors were not unitary even at the start of his career, it was possible to establish that a much larger potential space existed for the Spirit. Principally, by questioning the primacy and complexity of θέωσις language – and showing its functional equivalency to earlier ἀποθεώσις language as used by Gregory Thaumaturgus, and θεοποίησις language as used by Gregory himself (although it differed from his predecessors) – other more Spirit-oriented metaphors were allowed to come to the fore as equally important for understanding the experience of salvation which Gregory sought to express.[1]

Chapter 3 established that Gregory understood the defence of the Spirit's divinity as his mission. Crucially, the terms in which this divinity were to be defended were on the grounds of experience, and not on the basis of intellectual sketches or appeals to illustrations. This position set him at odds with Basil, whose *Hom*. 15 certainly contained an implication of the Spirit's divinity, but only on the basis of those methods to which Gregory objected. This analysis entailed a re-reading of *Ep*. 58, which in turn demonstrated that the dispute between Basil and Gregory did not simply regard the divinity of the Spirit as such, as it has sometimes been seen, but ultimately arose concerning a question of degree. For Gregory, sketches and illustrations were a first prin-

[1] *Pan*. 11.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

ciple, but personal experience of salvation was the only means by which the Spirit could properly illuminate believers. Chapter 4 examined what this investment looked like when put into practice in Constantinople – Gregory's first and last exercise of power on a large scale. In this context, Gregory proposed an image of salvation as a progressive purification of believers through the Spirit, which then constituted the Church through their harmonisation. Chapter 5 saw the apex of this development, with Gregory forcefully arguing for the Spirit as holiness and perfection in itself. The realisation of salvation in the believer was thus a manifestation and product not merely of the operation of the Spirit, but its nature as the perfection of the Trinity and, in the economy, as perfecting humanity.

Although Gregory's public career can, to a certain extent, be said to have ended with the delivery of the funeral oration for Basil with which Chapter 5 concluded, he continued to serve as bishop of Nazianzus, and write, until his death in 389. His investment in the defence of the Spirit, however, was not sustained. Much of this later, principally poetic, corpus mentions the Spirit, but it is much more strongly reflective and markedly less apologetic than Gregory's works contemporary with or preceding the Council.[2] The clearest example is in the *Poemata Arcana*, works that are often held up as displaying some of the best of Gregory's theology. While it is true that the *Arcana* are lucid and expressive, this cannot be said of *Carm*. 1.1.3, *On the Spirit*. The third of the poems in series is quite brief, and although it emphasises the divinity of the Spirit, it is far more concerned to emphasise the Trinity as three lights, as one nature, undivided. So far does this extend that in this poem it is the Trinity that Gregory posits to operate in baptism, rather than the Spirit in particular.[3] While the nature of the audience to which Gregory wrote this – believers just inducted into the church – may explain some of this emphasis, it does not explain all. This is the most explicitly Spirit-focused of Gregory's works after assuming the episcopacy of Nazianzus for the second time, judging by Gregory's own assertion that the poem is supposed to be about the Spirit. Yet even here Gregory is concerned with precisely the kind of abstract intellectual sketches of the Spirit's divinity for which he had derided Basil decades earlier. This naturally downplayed Gregory's soteriological pneumatology as well.

In light of the work carried out in the preceding chapters, it is clear that this absence is not a result of soteriological pneumatology being insignificant,

[2] On the character of Gregory's poetic corpus after 382 see in particular Francis Gautier, "Le carême de silence de Grégoire de Nazianze: Une conversion à la litérrature?" *Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques* 47 (2001): 99.

[3] Daley notes the emphasis on difficulty in articulating the Spirit clearly in the poem, and on the Trinity throughout. Brian Daley, "Systematic Theology in Homeric Dress: *Poemata Arcana*," in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (ed. Christopher Beeley; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012), 10.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

but of Gregory's defeat on what he personally regarded as his particular mission. Gregory's final years were shaded not just by this defeat but by the council which ejected him. The Council promulgated a creed Gregory regarded as failing to sufficiently emphasise the soteriological role of the Spirit or acknowledge the divinity that was a necessary consequence of that role. Such a defeat, even one qualified by his retaining an episcopacy, saw him retreat from a radical emphasis on the Spirit as the source of holiness and the source of all perfection even prior to the incarnation. The consequences of this intellectual withdrawal are apparent in the reception of Gregory's language, which saw Gregory praised for his erudition, but heralded no expansion of his thought on soteriological pneumatology until much later.[4]

In recovering an emphasis on soteriological pneumatology as an economic and not simply dogmatic operation in Gregory's thought, this project has not tried to overturn the articulation that the Spirit perfects "individually" what Christ perfects "universally." Rather, it has nuanced this expression by demonstrating how Gregory conceived of the Spirit as a being that was, undertook, and possessed perfection – holiness – by nature, and that the experience of the real presence of the Spirit by the believer was of central importance. In so doing, this study has put forward Gregory's salvation metaphors as expressions predicated on that experience. That is to say, they arise not just from his experience alone but develop out of an understanding that every believer experiences the Spirit, conditioned by an acknowledgement that even experience needs clear expression. This points back to Gregory's

[4] Gregory's reception by Cyril of Alexandria has been strongly asserted by Beeley. See Beeley, *Knowledge*, 322. A lucid counter-argument has been put forward by Hillis. While his characterisation of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology sits somewhat askance with that set out here, the points of difference he identifies between Gregory and Cyril seem broadly accurate. As he puts it, "If Cyril of Alexandria's pneumatology was indeed influenced by Gregory's pneumatology, one would expect a high level of congruity between their respective accounts of the Holy Spirit's role in human salvation." Hillis, "Pneumatology and Soteriology," 190. Cyril certainly could not make the same assertions as Gregory concerning the soteriological operation of the Spirit within the patriarchs, even if he does assert the deifying capacity of the Spirit as proof of its divinity. Ibid., "Pneumatology and Soteriology," 191; 191, n. 25. Likewise Russell's argument that, "The movement away from the language of *deification* towards that of *participation*, which is observable in Gregory of Nyssa, is confirmed by Cyril of Alexandria." Although Russell's assertion that Basil and Gregory Nazianzen engaged in an effort to "salvage" deification from Origen is questionable, its decline in Cyril is apparent. See Russell, *Deification*, 234. The reception of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology by Maximus is apparent, and the connection between deification and love in his thought has been noted. See McGuckin, "Strategic Adaptation," 97–98. On Maximus' concepts of deification, salvation, and the Spirit, though not on Gregory as such, see Torstein Tollefsen, *Activity and Participation in Late Antique and Early Christian Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 177–79 in particular.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

dispute with Basil. While *Hom*. 15 presented an argument for the divinity of the Spirit from scripture and logic, for Gregory it was insufficient to acknowledge that other people, even blessed disciples, received the Spirit. While biblical precedent and logical argument could be used to express doctrine, clearly the surest proof (and basis of the argument) was that the contemporary believer experienced the Spirit's holiness for themselves.[5]

In placing greater emphasis on the role of the Spirit, a certain amount of focus is necessarily drawn away from the Son. This is not to diminish Gregory's interest in the role of the incarnate Word. On the contrary, given the significance of Christ to his articulation of θέωσις, it is inevitable that the interest it has historically evoked would bias a reading of Gregory's soteriology and devalue his soteriological pneumatology. The Son realises the ultimate elevation of humanity into and towards the vision of God.[6] Where ultimate transformation is concerned, the focus must be on that final destiny realised by the Saviour. Nevertheless, it is insufficient to consider the Spirit as a subsidiary or extension of Gregory's theological programme, or to locate this ultimate elevation as the defining quality of it. Instead, any attempt to approach his soteriology or wider Trinitarianism must take account of the extent to which the Spirit's operation in salvation forms a groundwork for his other thought.

The current study, by examining Gregory's soteriological pneumatology more closely, brings further clarity to, and carries forward, arguments concerning the foundational nature of the Spirit.[7] The Spirit is the agent of salvation in life of the believer, deifying them in preparation for judgement by the Son. Likewise, it is the church which was centred on Gregory's Spirit. Believers are harmonised to each other and able to extend worthy love on account of the Spirit. Without it, there was no church. The foundational nature of the Spirit is best emphasised by this study's exposition of Gregory's un-

[5] This sits askance from Beeley's argument that the "ground" of Gregory's "confession of that the Spirit is God lies in his own experience of the Spirit's making him God, so that the Spirit's work in the Christian life is the source of the doctrine of the Spirit." It is somewhat more accurate to say that the grounds were scriptural, and that the most significant evidence was experiential. Beeley, *Knowledge*, 175. Kariatlis follows a similar line. Philip Kariatlis, "'What Then? Is the Spirit God? Certainly!' St Gregory's Teaching on the Holy Spirit as the Basis of the World's Salvation," *Phronema* 26, no. 2 (2011): 94.

[6] In this respect, Althaus is closer to the mark than Winslow. Althaus, *Heilslehre des heiligen*, 208; Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, 191. To some extent, this is an assent to Ellverson's position that Winslow overstates θέωσις, though with a very different emphasis. See Anna-Stina Ellverson, *The Dual Nature of Man: A Study in the Theological Anthropology of Gregory of Nazianzus*, (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1981), 101, n. 69.

[7] The concern expressed by Hofer regarding Beeley's assertion that "the doctrine of the Spirit gives rise to the doctrine of the Son" is addressed by this. While Beeley rightly identified the Spirit as foundational, Hofer is also correct to note the nuance this requires. See Beeley, *Knowledge*, 179; Hofer, *Christ*, 191, n. 196.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

derstanding of the Spirit as holiness, of God and creation. For Gregory, nothing is perfect that lacks the Spirit. The movement towards perfection begins in the real and substantial experience of the Spirit by the believer.

This reading of Gregory's soteriological pneumatology does not disregard the church. On the contrary, in forming the basis of his ecclesiology Gregory's soteriological pneumatology found its best expression in his later Constantinopolitan orations. Gregory possessed an ecclesiology that was structured in terms of soteriological pneumatology and Christology and did not possess an understanding of Church apart from the Spirit's purification of individuals. This was at its most apparent in his understanding of church leadership. The Spirit's soteriological operation perpetuated itself in structuring the Church, but that structure was itself a product of the Spirit, with those leading expected to be the most purified. Ultimately, while the Son was understood as saviour, effecting salvation potentially in the incarnation and realises it fully in the eschaton, the Spirit's part was to have been the perfection of the Godhead, the power of baptism in Christ and the believer, and the agent of salvation in that believer's experience. The Spirit was not to be a distant exemplar, or a curiosity to which one intellectually assented, but experienced as fully and really as the incarnate Christ was experienced. In this sense, and as he so forcefully articulated, Gregory saw the Spirit first. His salvation metaphors are thus principally expressions of this experience of the Spirit, while his arguments are supported by the access to scriptural meaning this provides.

While the relationship between Son and Spirit remains fundamental to this experience of the believer, some distinction must be made between effecting salvation and being saved. The Spirit makes salvation possible, but it is the Son who saves. The characterisation of deification as salvation overlooks this distinction in Gregory's thought. No believer is deified into being saved, for that is the work of the Son. Gregory's soteriological pneumatology is precisely the opposite: the holiness that is the Spirit purifies humanity as part of a soteriological process. There are boundaries to this process which make the incarnate Son the resolution and fulfilment of a process which was exemplified in Christ's life. Christ in his life, according to Gregory's thought, received his perfection from the deifying Spirit through an indwelling of equals. The recreation of believers in this image occurred by the action of the Spirit with the individual – an operation identified as Gregory's soteriological pneumatology that was, ultimately, the motivation for his greatest triumphs and the cause of his worst defeats. While it left him with only his tears to give for Constantinople and his church there, he portrayed a truly holy Spirit. Instead of a corollary to his Christology, soteriology, or ecclesiology, Gregory's Spirit was the basis of a developing doctrine that undergirded or reinforced his other theological commitments.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Bibliography

Primary Sources: Texts and Translations

Bernardi, Jean, ed., trans. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours. 4–5, Contre Julien*. SC 309. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1983.

–. *Grégoire de Nazianze: discours. 42–43*. SC 384. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992.

Calvet-Sebasti, Marie-Ange, ed., trans. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours. 6–12*. SC 405. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1995.

Daley, Brian. *Gregory of Nazianzus*. London: Routledge, 2006.

DelCogliano, Mark, Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, and Lewis Ayres, eds., trans. *Works on the Spirit: Athanasius and Didymus*. Popular Patristics Series 43. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011.

Gallay, Paul, ed., trans. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours. 27–31*. SC 250. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978.

–. ed., trans. *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze: Lettres*. Vol 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1964.

Gilbert, Peter, ed., trans. *On God and Man: The Theological Poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus*. Popular Patristics 21. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.

Heil, Uta, Annette v. Stockhausen, Hanns Christof Brennecke, and Angelika Wintjes, eds. *Athanasius Werke: Dokumente zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites*. Vol. 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Migne, Jacques Paul, ed. *PG*. Vol. 10.

–. ed. *PG*. Vol. 31.

–. ed. *PG*. Vol. 33.

–. ed. *PG*. Vol. 35.

Moreschini, Claudio, ed. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 32–37*. Translated by Paul Gallay. SC 318. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1985.

–. ed. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 38–41*. Translated by Paul Gallay. SC 358. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990.

Mossay, Justin, ed., trans. *Grégoire de Naizanze: Discours 20–23*. SC 270. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1980.

–. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 24–26*. SC 284. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1981.

Murray, A.T, trans. *Homer: The Iliad*. London: William Heinemann, 1924.

Norris, Frederick, ed. *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning: The Five Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991.

Price, Richard, Michael Gaddis ed. *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*. Vol. 3. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005.

Sykes, Donald A., ed. *Gregory of Nazianzus: Poemata Arcana*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Vinson, Martha, ed., trans. *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: Select Orations*. FC 107, 2003. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2003.
Wace, Henry, and Philip Schaff, ed. *NPNF, Second Series*. Vol. 7. 14 vols. Translated by Charles Browne and James Swallow. Buffalo: Christian Literature Publishing, 1894.
White, Carolinne, ed., trans. *Gregory of Nazianzus: Autobiographical Poems*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
Wickham, Lionel, and Frederick Williams, trans. *On God and Christ: The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius*. Popular Patristics 23. Crestwood: St Vladmir's Seminary Press, 2002.

Secondary Sources

Abrams Rebillard, Suzanne. "Historiography as Devotion: *Poemata de Seipso*." Pages 125–42 in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012.
–. "Speaking for Salvation: Gregory of Nazianzus as Poet and Priest in His Autobiographical Poems." PhD Thesis. Brown University, 2003.
–. "The Autobiographical *Prosopopoeia* of Gregory of Nazianzus." StPatr 47 (2010) 123–28.
–. "The Speech Act of Swearing: Gregory of Nazianzus's Oath in *Poema* 2.1.2 in Context." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21, no. 2 (2013): 177–207.
Alfeyev, Hilarion. "The Deification of Man in Eastern Patristic Tradition (With Special Reference to Gregory Nazianzen, Symeon the New Theologian, and Gregory Palamas." *Colloquium* 36, no. 2 (2004): 109–22.
Althaus, Heinz. *Die Heilslehre des heiligen Gregor von Nazianz*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1974.
Anatolios, Khaled. *Athanasius: The Coherence of His Thought*. London: Routledge, 1998.
Awad, Najeeb G. "Between Subordination and Koinonia: Toward a New Reading of the Cappadocian Theology." *Modern Theology* 23, no. 2 (2007): 191–204.
Ayres, Lewis. *Augustine and the Trinity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
–. *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
–. "The Holy Spirit as 'Undiminished Giver': Didymus the Blind's De Spiritu Sancto and the Development of Nicene Pneumatology." Pages 57–72 in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church*. Edited by Denis Vincent Twomey and Janet Rutherford. Portland: Four Courts Press, 2010.
Baghos, Mario. "St Gregory the Theologian's Metanarrative of History." *Phronema* 26, no. 2 (2011): 63–79.
Barnes, Michel René. "One Nature, One Power: Consensus Doctrine in Pro-Nicene Polemic." StPatr 29 (1997): 205–23.
–. "The Fourth Century as Trinitarian Canon." Pages 47–67 in *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric and Community*. Edited by Lewis Ayres and Gareth Jones. London: Routledge, 1998.
–. *The Power of God: Dunamis in Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2001.
Barnes, Timothy. *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
–. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Bayliss, Grant. *The Vision of Didymus the Blind: A Fourth-Century Virtue Origenism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Beeley, Christopher. "Divine Causality and the Monarchy of God the Father in Gregory of Nazianzus." *Harvard Theological Review* 100, no. 2 (2007): 199–214.

–. *Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God: In Your Light We Shall See Light*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

–. "The Holy Spirit in Gregory Nazianzen: The Pneumatology of Oration 31." Pages 151–62 in *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Honor of Lloyd Patterson*. Edited by Andrew McGowan, Brian Daley, and Timothy Gaden. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

–. "The Holy Spirit in the Cappadocians: Past and Present." *Modern Theology* 26, no. 1 (2010): 90–119.

–. *The Unity of Christ: Continuity and Conflict in Patristic Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Behr, John. *The Nicene Faith Part Two: One of the Holy Trinity*. Vol. 2. 3 vols. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004.

Beirne, Margaret. "Scripture in the Works of St Gregory the Theologian." *Phronema* 26, no. 2 (2011): 47–62.

Berkhof, Hendrikus. *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1964.

Bernardi, Jean. *La prédication des Pères Cappadociens. Le prédicateur et son auditoire.* Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de l'Universté Montpellier 30. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1968.

–. *Le Théologien et son temps (330–390)*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996.

Børtnes, Jostein "Rhetoric and Mental Images in Gregory." Pages 37–58 in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. Edited by Jostein Børtnes and Tomas Hägg. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

Brennecke, Hanns Christof. *Ecclesia est in re publica* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007),

Bucur, Bogdan G. and Elijah N. Mueller. "Gregory Nazianzen's Reading of Habbakuk 3:2 and Its Reception: A Lesson from Byzantine Scripture Exegesis." *Pro Ecclesia* 20, no. 1 (2011): 86–103.

Burgess, Stanley. *The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian Traditions*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1984.

Christensen, Michael J. "The Promise, Process, and Problem of *Theosis*." Pages 23–31 in *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions*. Edited by Michael Christensen and Jeffrey Wittung. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007.

Chryssavgis, John. "The Spiritual Way." *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Theology*. Edited by Mary Cunningham and Elizabeth Theokritoff. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Collins, Paul. "Between Creation and Salvation: Theosis and Theurgy." Pages 192–204 in *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*. Edited by V. Kharlamov. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Princeton Theological Monograph 156. Eugene: Pickwick, 2011.

Cross, Richard. "Divine Monarchy in Gregory of Nazianzus." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 14, no. 1 (2005): 105–16.

Daley, Brian. "Saint Gregory of Nazianzus as Pastor and Theologian." Pages 106–19 in *Loving God with Our Minds: The Pastor as Theologian; Essays in Honor of Wallace M. Alston*. Edited by Michael Welker and Cynthia Jarvis. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

–. "Systematic Theology in Homeric Dress: *Poemata Arcana*." Pages 3–12 in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus*. Edited by Christopher Beeley. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012.

Dawson, David. "Allegorical Reading and the Embodiment of the Soul in Origen." Pages 26–44 in *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric and Community*. Edited by Lewis Ayres and Gareth Jones. London: Routledge, 1998.

Day, Juliette. "Cyril of Jerusalem on the Holy Spirit." Pages 73–85 in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church*. Edited by Denis Vincent Twomey and Janet Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2010.

Demoen, Kristoffel. *Pagan and Biblical Exempla in Gregory Nazianzen: A Study in Rhetoric and Hermeneutics*. Brepols: Turnhout, 1996.

Doval, Alexis. "The Date of Cyril of Jerusalem's Catecheses." *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1997).

Egan, John P. "Toward Trinitarian Perichoresis: Saint Gregory the Theologian, Oration 31.14." StPatr 27 (1993): 21–29.

Ellverson, Anna-Stina. *The Dual Nature of Man: A Study in the Theological Anthropology of Gregory of Nazianzus*. Vol. 21. *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis* Series. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1981

Elm, Susanna. "A Programmatic Life: Gregory of Nazianzus' Orations 42 and 43 and the Constantinopolitan Elites." *Arethusa* 33, no. 3 (2000): 411–27.

–. "Gregory of Nazianzus: Mediation between Individual and Community." Pages 89–110 in *Group Identities and Religious Individuality in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Éric Rebillard and Jörg Rüpke. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2015.

–. "Gregory's Women: Creating a Philosopher's Family." Pages 171–92 in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. Edited by Jostein Børtnes and Tomas Hägg. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

–. "Inscriptions and Conversions: Gregory of Nazianzus on Baptism (Or. 38–40)." Pages 1–35 in *Conversion in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Seeing and Believing*. Edited by A. Grafton and K. Mills. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2003.

–. *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus and the Vision of Rome*. London: University of California Press, 2012.

Fairbairn, Donald. "Patristic Soteriology: Three Trajectories." *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society* 50, no. 2. (2007): 289–310.

Ferguson, Everett. *Baptism in Early Church History: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2009.

–. "Gregory's Baptismal Theology and the Alexandrian Tradition." Pages 67–83 in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus*. Edited by Christopher Beeley. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012.

Fialon, Eugène. *Étude historique et littéraire sur saint Basile: suivie l'Hexameron traduite en Francais*. Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1869.

Finch, Jeffrey. "Irenaeus on the Christological Basis of Human Divinization." Pages 86–103 in *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*. Edited by Stephen Finlan and Vladimir Kharlamov. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Princeton Theological Monograph 156. Eugene: Pickwick, 2006.

–. "Athanasius on the Deifying Work of the Redeemer." Pages 104–21 in *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*. Edited by Stephen Finlan and Vladimir Kharlamov. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Princeton Theological Monograph 156. Eugene: Pickwick, 2006.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Fleury, Eugène. *Héllenisme et christianisme. Saint Grégoire de Naizanze et son temps*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1930.

Floridi, Lucia. "The Epigrams of Gregory of Nazianzus Against Tomb Desecrators and Their Epigraphic Background." *Mnemosyne* 66, no. 1 (2013): 55–81.

Fulford, Ben. "Divine Eloquence and Human Transformation: Rethinking Scripture and History through Gregory of Nazianzus and Hans Frei." Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.

–. "Gregory of Nazianzus and Biblical Interpretation." Pages 31–48 in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus*. Edited by Christopher Beeley. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012.

Galtier, Paul. *Saint-Esprit en nous d'après les Pères Grecs*. Rome: Apud Aedes Universitas Gregorianae, 1946.

Gautier, Francis. "Grégoire L'innovateur? Tradition et innovation théologiques chez Grégoire de Nazianze." *Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques* 53 (2007): 235–66.

–. "Le carême de silence de Grégoire de Nazianze: Une conversion à la litérrature?" *Revue D'études augustiniennes et patristiques*, no. 47 (2001): 97–143.

–. *Le retraite et le sacerdoce chez Grégoire de Nazianze*. Vol. 114. Bibliotheque de l'École des Hautes Études. Sciences Religieuses. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.

Gavrilyuk, Paul L. "The Retrieval of Deification: How a Once-Despised Archaism Became an Ecumenical Desideratrum." *Modern Theology* 25, no. 4 (2009): 647–659.

Gifford, James. *Perichoretic Salvation: The Believer's Union with Christ as a Third Type of Perichoresis*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011.

Giulea, Dragoş A. "The Divine Essence, That Inaccessible Kabod Enthroned in Heaven: Nazianzen's Oratio 28, 3 and the Tradition of Apophatic Theology from Symbols to Philosophical Concepts Introduction: Nazianzen's Text and Its Twofold Background." *Numen* 57 (2010): 1–29.

Golitzin, Alexander. "Adam, Eve, and Seth: Pneumatological Reflections on an Unusual Image in Gregory of Nazianzus's 'Fifth Theological Oration.'" *Anglican Theological Review* 83, no. 3 (2001): 537–47.

Gregg, Robert C. "Cyril of Jerusalem and the Arians." Pages 85–109 in *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments*. Edited by Robert C. Gregg. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2006.

Grillmeier, Aloys. "Christ in Christian Tradition." *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon*. Edited by John. Bowden. Vol. 1. London: A.R Mowbry, 1975.

Gross, Jules. *The Divinization of the Christian According to the Greek Fathers*. Translated by Paul A. Onica. Anaheim: A&C Press, 2002.

Hägg, Tomas. "Playing with Expectations: Gregory's Funeral Oration for His Brother, Sister and Father." Pages 133–52 in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. Edited by Jostein Børtnes and Tomas Hägg. Copenhagen: Museum TusculanumPress, 2006.

Hanson, R.P.C. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.

Harakas, Stanley S. "Presuppositions for Ethical Method in St. Gregory the Theologian's Five Theological Orations." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 55, no. 1 (2010): 89–126.

Harrison, Verna. "Greek Patristic Foundations of Trinitarian Anthropology." *Pro Ecclesia* 14, no. 4 (2004): 399–413.

–. "Illuminated from All Sides by the Trinity: Neglected Themes in Gregory Nazianzen's Trinitarian Theology." Pages 13–30 in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus*. Edited by

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Christopher Beeley. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012.
–. "Theosis as Salvation: An Orthodox Perspective." *Pro Ecclesia* 6 (1997): 429–43.
Harnack, Adolf von. *History of Dogma*. Edited by N. Buchanan. 3rd ed. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1976.
Haykin, Michael A.G. "And Who Is the Spirit? Basil of Caesarea's Letters to the Church at Tarsus." *VC* 41, no. 4 (1987): 377–85.
–. *The Spirit of God: Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
Hildebrand, Stephen M. *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea: A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007.
Hillis, Gregory. "Pneumatology and Soteriology according to Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria." StPatr 67 (2013): 187–97.
Hofer, Andrew. *Christ in the Life and Teaching of Gregory of Nazianzus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
Holman, Susan R. "Healing the Social Leper in Gregory of Nyssa's and Gregory of Nazianzus's 'περὶ φιλοπτωχίας.'" *Harvard Theological Review* 92, no. 3 (1999): 283–309.
Humphries, Thomas L. *Ascetic Pneumatology from John Cassian to Gregory the Great*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
Jacobs, Nathan. "On 'Not Three Gods' – Again: Can a Primary-Secondary Substance Reading of Ousia and Hypostasis Avoid Tritheism?" *Modern Theology* 24, no. 3 (2008): 331–58.
Kalleres, Dayna. "Demons and Divine Illumination: A Consideration of Eight Prayers by Gregory of Nazianzus." *VC* 61, no. 2 (2007): 157–88.
Kariatlis, Philip. "'What Then? Is the Spirit God? Certainly!' St. Gregory's Teaching on the Holy Spirit as the Basis of the World's Salvation." *Phronema* 26, no. 2 (2011): 81–102.
Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti, ed. *Holy Spirit and Salvation: The Sources of Christian Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010.
–. ed. *One with God: Salvation as Deification and Justification*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2004.
–. ed. *Spirit and Salvation: A Constructive Christian Theology for a Pluralistic World*. Vol. 4. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2016.
Kharlamov, Vladimir. "Rhetorical Application of *Theosis* in Greek Patristic Theology." Pages 115–31 in *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions*. Edited by Michael Christensen and Jeffrey Wittung. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007.
–. "*Theosis* in Patristic Thought." *Theology Today* 65, no. 2 (2008): 158–68.
Kirsten, Ernst, "Cappadocia." Pages 861–91 in vol. 2 of the *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*. Edited by Theodor Klauser. 28 vols. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1954.
Kurmann, Alois. *Gregor von Nazianz, Oratio IV Gegen Julian. Ein Kommentar*. Bâle: F. Reinhardt, 1988.
Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
Langworthy, Oliver. "Theodoret's Theologian: Assessing the Origin and Significance of Gregory of Nazianzus' Title." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 70, no. 3 (2019): 455–71.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Lampe, Geoffrey W.H, ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 23rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010

Leahy, Brendan. "'Hiding Behind the Works': The Holy Spirit in the Trinitarian Rhythm of Human Fulfilment in the Theology of Ireneaus." Pages 11–33 in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church*. Edited by Denis Vincent Twomey and Janet Rutherford. Portland: Four Courts Press, 2010.

Lenz, John. "Deification of the Philosopher in Classical Greece." Pages 47–67 in *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions*. Edited by Michael Christensen and Jeffrey Wittung. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007.

Lienhard, Joseph T. *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999.

–. "The Exegesis of 1 Cor 15:24–28 From Marcellus of Ancyra to Theodoret of Cyrus." *VC* 37 (1983): 340–59.

Limberis, Vasiliki. "'Religion' as the Cipher for Identity: The Cases of Emperor Julian, Libanius, and Gregory Nazianzus." *Harvard Theological Review* 93, no. 4 (2011): 373–400.

Louth, Andrew. *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition: From Plato to Denys*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Lossky, Vladimir. "Redemption and Deification." *In the Image and Likeness of God* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974).

–. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976.

Lössl, Josef. "Theology as academic discourse." *Journal for Late Antique Religion and Culture* 10 (2015): 38–72.

Lugaresi, Leonardo. *Gregorio Di Nazianzo: Contro Giuliano l'Apostata, Orazione IV*. Firenze: Nardini Editore, 1993.

Macaskill, Grant. *Union with Christ in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Majercik, Ruth. "A Reminiscence of the Chaldean Oracles at Gregory of Nazianzus *Or*. 29, 2: *Oion Krater Tis Hupererrue*." *VC* 52 (1998): 286–92.

Mantzaridis, Georgios. "Self-Knowledge and Knowledge of God According to St Gregory the Theologian." *Phronema* 26, no. 2 (2011): 11–25.

Markschies, Christoph. *Christian Theology and its Institutions in the Early Roman Empire: Prolegomena to a History of Early Christian Theology*. Translated by W. Coppins. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2015.

Maslov, Boris. "The Limits of Platonism: Gregory of Nazianzus and the Invention of *theōsis*." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 52 (2012): 440–68.

McConnell, Timothy P. *Illumination in Basil of Caesarea's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014.

McGuckin, John. "Autobiography as *Apologia* in St. Gregory Nazianzen." StPatr 37 (2001): 160–77.

–. "Gregory: The Rhetorician as Poet." Pages 193–212 in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. Edited by Jostein Børtnes and Tomas Hägg. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

–. "'Perceiving Light from Light in Light' (Oration 31.2)": The Trinitarian Theology of St. Gregory the Theologian.'" *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 39, no. 1 (1994): 7–32.

–. *St Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

–. "The Strategic Adaptation of Deification in the Cappadocians." Pages 95–114 in *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions*. Edited by Michael Christensen and Jeffrey Wittung. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007.

–. "The Vision of God in St. Gregory Nazianzen." StPatr 32. (1998): 142–52

McLynn, Neil. "Gregory the Peacemaker: A Study of Oration Six." *Kyoyo-Ronso* 101 (1996): 183–216.

–. "The Other Olympias: Gregory Nazianzen and the Family of Vitalianus." *Journal of Ancient Christianity* 2, no. 2 (1998): 227–46.

Meijering, Eginhard P. "The Doctrine of Will and the Trinity in the Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus." *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 27.3 (1973): 224–34.

Menzies, Robert P. *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts*. *JSNTSup* 54. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Meredith, Anthony. "The Pneumatology of the Cappadocian Fathers and the Creed of Constantinople." *The Irish Theological Quarterly* 48 (1981): 196–211.

Miller, Patricia. *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Milovanovic-Barham, Celica. "Gregory of Nazianzus: *Ars Poetica* (In suos versus: Carmen 2.1.39)." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5, no. 4 (1997): 497–510.

Molac, Philippe. "Purification and Holiness: A Perspective on Communion from Gregory of Nazianzus: An Approach from Discourse 40." *Scripta Theologica* 41, 3 (2009): 833–42.

Moreschini, Claudio. "Aspetti della Pneumatologia in Gregorio Nazianzeno e Basilio." Pages 567–78 in *Basilio di Caesarea: La sua età, la sua opera e il basilianesimo in Sicilia*, Vol. 1. Messine: Centro di studi umanistici, 1983.

–. "Gregory Nazianzen and Philosophy, with Remarks on Gregory's Cynicism." Pages 103–24 in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus*. Edited by Christopher Beeley. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012.

–. and Enrico Norelli. *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. Vol. 2. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005.

–. *I padri cappadoci: Storia, letteratura, teologia*. Rome: Città Nuova, 2008.

Mossay, Justin. *La Mort et l'au-delà dans saint Grégoire de Nazianze*. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1966.

Narkevics, Edgar. "*Skiagraphia*: Outlining the Conception of God in Gregory's *Theological Orations*." Pages 83–112 in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. Edited by Jostein Børtnes and Tomas Hägg. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

Noble, Thomas A. "Paradox in Gregory Nazianzen's Doctrine of the Trinity." StPatr 27. (1993): 94–99.

–. "The Deity of the Holy Spirit According to Gregory of Nazianzus." PhD, Edinburgh University, 1989.

Norris, Frederick. *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning: The Five Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991.

–. "Gregory Contemplating the Beautiful: Knowing Human Misery and Divine Mystery through and Being Persuaded by Images." Pages 19–36 in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. Edited by Jostein Børtnes and Tomas Hägg. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

–. "Of Thorns and Roses: The Logic of Belief in Gregory Nazianzen." *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 53 (1984): 455–64.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

–. "Universal Salvation in Origen and Maximus." Pages 35–72 in *Universalism and the Doctrine of Hell: Papers Presented at the Fourth Edinburgh Conference in Christian Dogmatics*. Edited by Nigel Cameron. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991.

Opperwall, Donald. "The Holy Spirit in Gregory of Nazianzus." McMaster University, 2012.

Papaioannou, Stratis. "Gregory and the Constraint of Sameness." Pages 59–82 in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. Edited by Jostein Børtnes and Tomas Hägg. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

Parvis, Sara. *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy 325–345*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Plagnieux, Jean. *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze théologien*. Paris: Éditions Franciscaines, 1952.

Plaxco, Kellen. "Participation and Trinity in Origen and Didymus the Blind." Pages 767–82 in *Origeniana Undecima: Origen and Origenism in the History of Western Thought*. Edited by Anders-Christian Jacobsen. Leuven: Peeters Press, 2016.

Prestige, G.L. *God in Patristic Thought*. London: William Heinemann, 1936.

Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew. *Basil of Caesarea: A Guide to His Life and Doctrine*. Cascade Companions 16. Eugene: Cascade Books, 2012.

Rousseau, Phillip. "Retrospect: Images, Reflections and the 'Essential' Gregory." Pages 283–96 in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. Edited by Jostein Børtnes and Tomas Hägg. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

Ruether, Rosemary R. *Gregory of Nazianzus: Rhetor and Philosopher*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Russell, Norman. *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Schermann, Theodor. *Die Gottheit des heiligen Geistes nach den griechischen Vätern des vierten Jahrhunderts*. Freiburg: Herder, 1901.

Schwöbel, Christoph. "The Trinity between Athens and Jerusalem." *Journal of Reformed Theology* 3 (2009): 22–41.

Scully, Ellen. *Physicalist Soteriology of Hilary of Poitiers*. Supplement to *VC* 130. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Simonetti, Manlio. *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1975.

Soskice, Janet. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Stead, Christopher. *Divine Substance*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.

–. "Logic and the Application of Names to God." Pages 303–20 in *El "Contra Eunomium I" en la producción literaria de Gregorio de Nisa: Sixth International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa*. Edited by Lucas Mateo-Seco and Juan Bastero. Pamploma: Universidad de Navarra, 1988.

–. *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Stepanos, Efthymiadis. "Two Gregories and Three Genres: Autobiography, Autohagiography and Hagiography." Pages 239–56 in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. Edited by Jostein Børtnes and Tomas Hägg. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

Stephenson, Anthony A. "St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Trinitarian Theology." StPatr 11 (1972): 234–41.

Swete, Henry. *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*. London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1912.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Tabbernee, William. "Gregory of Nazianzus, Montanism, and the Holy Spirit." Pages 84–102 in *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus*. Edited by Christopher Beeley. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012.

Telepneff, Gregory. "Theopaschite Language in the Soteriology of Saint Gregory the Theologian." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 32, no. 4 (1987): 403–16.

Tollefsen, Torstein. *Activity and Participation in Late Antique and Early Christian Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

–. "*Theosis* according to Gregory." Pages 257–70 in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*. Edited by Jostein Børtnes and Tomas Hägg. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

van Dam, Raymond. "Becoming Christian: The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia."Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2003.

–. *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.

Torrance, Alexis. "Precedents for Palamas' Essence-Energies Theology in the Cappadocian Fathers." *VC* 63 (2009): 47–70.

–. *Repentance in Late Antiquity: Eastern Asceticism and the Framing of the Christian Life c.400–650 CE*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Torrance, Thomas F. *The Trinitarian Faith*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.

Trigg, Joseph W. "Knowing God in the Theological Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus: The Heritage of Origen." *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Honor of Lloyd Patterson*. Edited by Andrew McGowan, Brian Daley, and Timothy Gaden. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

–. *Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third Century Church*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983.

Tsamis, Dimitrios. *The Dialectical Character of the Teaching of Gregory the Theologian*. Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1969.

Tzamalikos, Panayiotis, ed. *An Ancient Commentary on the Book of Revelation: A Critical Edition of the* Scholia in Apocalypsin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

–. *Anaxagoras, Origen, and Neoplatonism: The Legacy of Anaxagoras to Classical and Late Antiquity*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.

Vaggione, Richard Paul. *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Wallraff, Martin. *Sonnenkönig der Spätantike: die Religionspolitik Konstantins des Großen*. Freiburg: Herder, 2013.

Wessel, Susan. "The Suffering of Christ, Humanity and the Lepers in Gregory Nazianzen." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 68, no. 4 (2015): 381–97.

Widdicombe, Peter. "The Fatherhood of God from Origen to Athanasius." Oxford: Claredon, 1994.

Williams, Rowan. "The Logic of Arianism." *Journal of Theological Studies* 34 (1983): 56–81.

Winslow, Donald. "Gregory of Nazianzus and Love for the Poor." *Anglican Theological Review* 35 (1965): 348–59.

–. *The Dynamics of Salvation: A Study in Gregory of Nazianzus*. Cambridge: The Philadelphia Patristic Institute, 1979.

Ziebritzki, Henning. *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele: Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.

Zizoulas, John. *Being as Communion*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Index of References

Ancient Authors

Athanasius of Alexandria

Epistulae ad Serapionem

1.2	38 n. 86
1.22	38
1.23	38
1.24–25	40
1.26	38
1.27	38
1.30	39 n. 89, 40 n. 93
1.31	38. n. 88
2.4	40
3.4	39
4.23	40

De incarnatione verbi

9–10	39 n. 90

Basil of Caesarea

Homilia

15	12, 69, 71, 88–91, 92, 94, 97, 162, 165
15.3	89, 90

Cyril of Jerusalem

Catecheses ad illuminandos

16	33–36
16.2	35
16.3	35
16.3–4	35
16.5	35
16.22	35 n. 78
16.24	34 n. 74, 35 n. 77
17	33–36
17.2	35
17.5	35
17.29	35
17.33	35

Didymus of Alexandria

De Spiritu Sancto

10	42
13	42
16	42
19	42
26	43
55	41 n. 99
84	43
85	43
86	43
117	43
121	43
122	43
123	43
124	43
143	43

Gregory of Nazianzus

Carmen

1.1.3	163
1.1.3.19–21	23
1.1.3.29–31	25
1.1.4	51
1.1.4.92	120 n. 60
1.1.5.34–40	151
1.1.6.53–67	120 n. 60
1.1.7	15, 16 n. 8
1.1.7.55–56	15
1.1.7.73	15 n. 4
1.1.7.74–75	15
1.1.7.76–77	15
1.1.7.78	15
1.1.7.79	15

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

1.1.7.91 15
1.2.34 15 n. 7
2.1.11.53 148 n. 45
2.1.11.55–58 3 n. 11
2.1.11.90 147 n. 43
2.1.11.112 148 n. 48
2.1.11.113–14 150 n. 57
2.1.11.116 150 n. 56
2.1.11.119–20 150 n. 56
2.1.11.164–65 148
2.1.11.195–99 148
2.1.11.205–08 148–49
2.1.11.211–22 3 n. 14
2.1.11.274 150 n. 58
2.1.11.310–11 150
2.1.11.343 150
2.1.11.345 3 n. 15
2.1.11.347 150 n. 61
2.1.11.351–53 4 n. 18
2.1.11.371 4 n. 22
2.1.11.446–51 5 n. 23
2.1.11.490–98 5 n. 24
2.1.11.547–49 5 n. 27
2.1.11.591–92 5 n. 29
2.1.11.592 151, 157 n. 78
2.1.11.1310–12 152
2.1.11.1322–24 152
2.1.11.1680 153 n. 69
2.1.11.1703 6 n. 32
2.1.11.1703–11 153
2.1.11.1865–68 146
2.1.11.1919–22 154
2.1.11.1943–99 154
2.1.12.1–3 155 n. 74

Epistula
1 83
2 83
6 51, 58, 63, 67
6.3–4 4 n. 19, 50–51, 52, 55 n. 33
6.4 61
20 145 n. 35
45 72 n. 10, 73, 80
45.1 74, 97 n. 84
48.9–10 74–75
58 5 n. 26, 51 n. 19, 69, 71, 84, 91, 96, 98 n. 87, 162
58.7 92
58.8 93
58.11 93
58.14 94, 97
71 98 n. 87
71.1 94 n. 76
164.1 74 n. 20

Oratio
1 53 n. 28, 63, 67
1.1 52 n. 23
1.2 4 n. 20, 52, 53, 66, 67
1.4–5 61
1.5 53
1.6 53, 54
2 42 n. 100, 54–55, 58, 60, 61, 63, 67, 83, 104, 110, 133, 136 n. 5, 140 n. 18
2.3 55
2.7 4 n. 20, 55–56, 60, 64
2.22 56, 61
2.28 57 n. 42
2.33 61
2.39 58
2.40 57 n. 42, 61 n. 59
2.72 74 n. 20
2.73 57
2.97 56 n. 39
2.105 58 n. 48
3 55, 58, 63, 67
3.1 58, 62
4 4, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 68, 75
4.54 60 n. 58, 65 n. 74
4.71 61, 62
4.88 61 n. 59
5 45
5.35 74 n. 20
6 63, 64, 66, 68, 73, 78
6.1 63
6.7 63
6.8 63
6.9 73, 74, 80, 97 n. 84
6.17 66 n. 80
7 4

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

7.9 66
7.15 66, 145 n. 35, 149 n. 54
7.23 66 n. 81, 67
7.24 66
8 4, 66 n. 82
8.15 67 n. 83
8.20 67
9 5, 75, 76, 82
9.1 76
9.2 77, 86
9.2–3 76
9.6 77
10 5, 75, 79, 80, 81, 88, 112 n. 42, 136 n. 5
10.1 80
10.2 5 n. 25, 80
10.3 74 n. 20, 80 n. 43
10.4 79–80
11 5, 6 n. 33, 75 n. 26, 78–79, 136 n. 5
11a 75, 78, 79
11b 75, 78, 79
11.2 78 n. 33
11.3 78
11.4 79 n. 36
11.5 78
11.6 79 n. 36, 84
12 5, 75, 81, 83, 88, 91, 97, 112 n. 42, 136 n. 5
12.4 81–83
12.5 83
12.6 74, 83–84, 87, 91, 93, 94, 99, 102
13 71, 81, 87, 88, 91, 93, 97, 112 n. 42
13.4 84, 87, 88 n. 65
14 4, 68, 109, 124
14.2 64 n. 72
14.5 64
14.7 64
14.14 64
14.27 65, 67, 90
14.30 65
16 85, 97
16.1 86
16.2 86 n. 61
16.4 85–86
16.5 151 n. 62
16.8 86 n. 61
16.11 86 n. 61
16.15 85
17 85, 97
17.8 86
17.9–10 86–87
18.1 96
18.2 95 n. 78
18.12 95
18.13 95
18.34 151 n. 62
18.36 95
19.2 96
20 6 n. 30, 99, 102 n. 11
20.1 56 n. 35, 104
20.4 103–04, 105
20.12 104–05, 106
21 6 n. 30, 99, 109
21.2 116
21.7 115
21.31 74 n. 20
22 6 n. 30
22.1 108
22.4 107–08
22.13 106 n. 20, 107 n. 27
22.15 106, 107, 124 n. 74
23 6 n. 30, 20
23.4 114
23.11 20, 21, 22, 26 n. 45
23.13 106 n. 20
24 6 n. 30
24.8 106
25 6 n. 31, 134–35, 143, 145
25.6 138
25.15 16–17
25.16 135, 137, 138, 139, 140
25.17 18 n. 14
26 6 n. 31, 134, 135, 139–40, 143, 145
26.2 139, 140 n. 17
29 126
29.2 19 n. 16, 21 n. 26, 22, 23 n. 33
29.19 124 n. 72, 145 n. 36
29.19–20 126–27

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

29.20 127–28, 129, 131
30.1 123 n. 68
30.2 124 n. 72
30.4 124, 125, 129
30.14 125, 132
31 6, 12, 31 n. 28, 51, 88, 90, 99, 113, 117, 118, 123, 124, 129, 130, 133, 137, 140, 145, 155
31.2 23 n. 36, 26–27, 136–37, 138–39
31.3 22
31.4 1, 62 n. 65, 124, 125, 135, 137, 138, 140 n. 21
31.6 21
31.8 17, 123, 136 n. 4
31.9 18
31.10 45 n. 110, 45 n. 111
31.12 18
31.14 21
31.25 145 n. 35
31.26 102 n. 9, 153 n. 68
31.26–27 101 n. 8
31.27 2, 123
31.28 84 n. 52, 88 n. 65, 100 n. 4, 131
31.28–29 100–01
31.29 24, 130, 131, 132
32 6 n. 30, 109, 111
32.1 109 n. 31, 110
32.11 110
32.24 110–11
33 6 n. 30, 109, 111
33.9 111–12
33.12 112
33.13 112
33.15 112–13
33.16 84 n. 52, 88 n. 65
33.17 113
34 6 n. 30, 109
34.6 116
34.12 116
34.13 117
36 6 n. 31
36.12 109 n. 31
37 6 n. 31, 134, 135, 141
37.1 141 n. 24
37.7 141 n. 24
37.13 141 n. 24
37.17 141
37.16 141
38 6 n. 31, 15–16
38.8 20, 21, 126 n. 77
38.9 120 n. 60
38.12 15
38.12–13 16 n. 8
38.18 142
39 6 n. 31, 143
39.9 143 n. 28
39.11 18 n. 13
39.17 148 n. 46, 149
39.20 143
40 6 n. 31, 80 n. 39, 143, 149
40.1 144 n. 31
40.6 144 n. 31
40.9 109 n. 31, 144
40.15 144 n. 33
40.26 144 n. 31
40.29 145
40.30 131
40.33 144 n. 31
40.41 19
40.43 19
40.44 144 n. 31
40.45 26, 143, 145 n. 37
40.46 144 n. 31
41 6 n. 30, 51, 88, 99, 113, 117, 118, 123, 125, 133, 145
41.4 74 n. 20
41.6 122
41.8 122
41.9 118
41.10 118
41.11 119, 120–21, 129 n. 97, 139
41.14 118, 121
42 156, 158
42.1 156–57
42.2 156 n. 75
42.8 156 n. 75, 158
42.14 156 n. 75
42.16 159
42.18 156 n. 75

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

43 73 n. 13, 97 n. 86, 156
43.40 160 n. 85
43.43 160 n. 85
43.63 144 n. 31
43.68 160
45 53 n. 28
45.1 73
45.6 109 n. 31

Gregory Thaumaturgus

In Origenem oratio panegyrica
11 59–60, 162 n. 1

Gregory the Presbyter

Vita Sancti Gregorii
1.1 101 n. 7
3 3 n. 13

Marcellus of Ancyra

Fragmenta
52 30 n. 58
43.11 159–60
43.37 73 n. 14
61 30 n. 58
63 30 n. 56
66 30 n. 56, 30 n. 59, 31
67 30 n. 59, 30 n. 60
68 31, 61 n. 63
69 30 n. 56
73 31 n. 63
74 30 n. 56
81–83 30 n. 56
96 30 n. 56
97 30 n. 56
107 30
110 30
111 30
117 30

De incarnatione et contra Arianos
9 31 n. 65

Scriptural Texts

Old Testament

Genesis
3:1 112 n. 38
3:6 112 n. 38
3:22 112 n. 38

Exodus
4:16 78 n. 33
7:1 78 n. 33
17:8–13 78 n. 33

1 Samuel
1:28 147
10:6 76

Job
33:4 (LXX) 119 n. 58

Psalms
32 (33):6 119 n. 58
36 (37) 117 n. 55
82:1 124 n. 73
99:6 78 n. 33
103 (104):30 119 n. 58

Isaiah
53:5 128 n. 96
61:1 52
61:6 52 n. 25
66:1 158 n. 80

Jeremiah
23:24 158 n. 80

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Deuterocanonical Books

Wisdom
7:26 56

New Testament

Matthew
1:18–25 126 n. 81
2:1–12 126 n. 83
3:14–17 127 n. 87
4:1–11 127 n. 88
4:21 74 n. 19
5:15 73 n. 18, 74, 80, 83–84, 93, 97
5:18 58 n. 48
8:28–34 128 n. 93
9:35 128 n. 96
12:34 126 n. 85
14:13–21 127 n. 88
14:22–27 128 n. 91
14:28–33 128 n. 91
19:24 127 n. 86
26:15 128 n. 95
27:34 129 n. 99
27:45 129 n. 98
27:50 129 n. 100
27:51–52 129 n. 100
28:19 113 n. 45
28:20 43

Mark
1:9–11 127 n. 87
5:1–20 128 n. 93
6:30–44 127 n. 88
6:45–52 128 n. 91
15:23 129 n. 99
15:33 129 n. 98
15:37 129 n. 100

Luke
1:41 126 n. 82
2:8–20 126 n. 83
3:21–22 127 n. 87
4:1–13 127 n. 88
4:18 52

8:16 74 n. 19
8:26–39 128 n. 93
9:12–27 127 n. 88
11:33 74 n. 19
12:11–12 43
19:9 103, 104
20:19–25 128 n. 92
21:14–15 43
23:36 129 n. 99
23:43 129 n. 98
23:46 129 n. 100

John
1:1 128 n. 96
1:13 52 n. 22
1:23 128 n. 96
1:26–36 127 n. 87
2:7–9 129 n. 100
3:4 126 n. 85
3:5 119 n. 58
5:21 129 n. 100
6:1–14 127 n. 88
6:1–35 127 n. 88
6:19 128 n. 91
6:57 127 n. 86
7:37 127 n. 89
7:38 127 n. 90
8:48 128 n. 93
8:59 128 n. 94
10:17–18 129 n. 100
11:1–46 128 n. 94
14:2 124 n. 73
14:26 123 n. 70

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

15.26 30, 31, 32–33, 61, 123 n. 70, 124
16:13–14 31, 35
16:15 127 n. 86
17:10 127 n. 86
17:11 43
19:29 129 n. 99
19:30 129 n. 100
20:22 31

Acts
17:28 156
27 148

Romans
5:1–2 79
5:2 79–80, 82
5:11 79
6:4 52 n. 22, 113 n. 45
8:17 64 n. 73
8:26–27 43, 115
12:5 110
13:14 64 n. 73

1 Corinthians
1:24 43
2:6 63 n. 69
2:13 110
3:13 110 n. 32
3:16–17 116 n. 54
4:1 96 n. 82
6:9 116 n. 54
6:19 139 n. 13
8:6 158 n. 80
12:15 64 n. 71
13:2 56 n. 38
14:32 157
15:22 112 n. 38
15:42 112 n. 38
15:45 112 n. 38
15:49 112 n. 38

2 Corinthians
3:18 56
5:17 52 n. 22
5:18–21 79 n. 38
6:16 113 n. 43

Galatians
2:2 156
3:27 64 n. 73
5:26 156

Ephesians
1:13–14 43
4:4 64 n. 71
4:15 55
4:16 110
4:24 52 n. 22
4:30 43

2 Timothy
1:14 156
2:5 122 n. 67

Hebrews
8:2 78 n. 33

2 Peter
1:4 50

1 John
4:12–13 108–09

Revelation
21:10 56

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Subject Index

Alfeyev, Hilarion 126 n. 78
Althaus, Heinz 7–8, 46, 106, 165 n. 6
Anatolios, Khaled 39, 40 n. 92
angels 37, 56, 89, 119, 120, 121, 122, 139
anthropology 15–16, 51 n. 21, 62, 89, 110, 116, 132
Apollinarians, the 151
apotheōsis 59–60, 162
Arianism 4, 5, 7
asceticism 57, 58, 61, 62, 83, 111, 150
Athanasius of Alexandria 11, 14, 27, 28 n. 51, 29 n. 55, 37–41, 42, 43–44, 45, 61, 99, 109, 110, 114–15, 116, 140 n. 20
Augustine of Hippo 107 n. 26
Awad, Najeeb G. 25 n. 41
Ayres, Lewis 16 n. 9, 20 n. 22, 29 n. 55, 30 n. 57, 30 n. 61, 33 n. 71, 36 n. 79, 43, 45 n. 111

Baghos, Mario 145 n. 35
baptism 10, 15, 24, 25, 26, 27, 33, 50, 54, 56–57, 67, 95, 100, 102, 113–14, 117, 127, 142, 143, 144–45, 148–49, 154, 155, 159, 163, 166
Barnes, Michel René 20 n. 22, 40 n. 95, 140 n. 20
Basil of Caesarea 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10 n. 47, 12, 14, 20, 45 n. 111, 49, 50, 51 n. 18, 58, 65, 69–98, 99, 102, 140, 150, 152 n. 64, 156, 159–61, 162, 163, 164 n. 4, 165
Bayliss, Grant 42
Beeley, Christopher 6 n. 30, 9–10, 19, 45 n. 110, 53 n. 28, 71, 75, 80, 84 n. 52, 88 n. 65, 106, 136, 137, 138, 152 n. 67, 153 n. 68, 164 n. 4, 165 n. 5, 165 n. 7
Behr, John 101 n. 8
Berkhof, Hendrikus 138 n. 12
Bernardi, Jean 56–57, 58, 157
Børtnes, Jostein 15 n. 7
Browne, Charles Gordon 49–50, 92
Burgess, Stanley 72 n. 8

Caesarius 5, 65–66, 145 n. 35
Calvet-Sebasti, Marie-Ange 73, 74 n. 19, 84 n. 52
child-birth imagery 86
Christensen, Michael 48 n. 13
Christology 2, 10, 11, 24–25, 30–31, 32, 38–40, 41, 42, 44, 47, 52, 56, 79, 81, 82, 88, 95, 100, 101, 104, 105, 110, 111–12, 117, 118–33, 134, 142–43, 144, 145, 152–53, 154, 155, 164, 165, 166
Chryssavgis, John 154 n. 72
church 5, 12, 31, 51, 54–58, 60 n. 57, 63–64, 83, 85, 86, 95, 97, 99–109, 129, 132, 133, 147 n. 44, 158–59, 163, 165, 166
– unity of 106, 109–11, 114, 115
citizenship 112
Clement of Alexandria 154 n. 72
Constantine I 3, 7, 29
Constantius II 3–4
contemplation *see theōria*
cosmology 15
councils
– Chalcedon 1, 101
– Constantinople 6, 134, 145, 146, 153, 155, 156, 161, 163, 164
– Nicaea 3, 29
Cross, Richard 16 n. 9
Cyprian of Antioch 106
Cyril of Alexandria 164 n. 4

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

Cyril of Jerusalem 11, 14, 27, 28 n. 51, 33–37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 139 n. 13

Daley, Brian 92 n. 72, 136, 137, 138, 163 n. 3
Day, Juliette 34 n. 75, 35 n. 76, 36 n. 80
deification *see theōsis*
Demoen, Kristoffel 147 n. 42
Diadochus of Photike 49
Didymus of Alexandria 11, 14, 27, 28 n. 51, 41–44, 45
duty 81–83

ecclesiology *see* church
Egyptian bishops 99, 109, 114–15
Ellverson, Anna-Stina 165 n. 6
Elm, Susanna 11, 15, 46, 57 n. 43, 59, 82 n. 47
engraving 53–54
Enomius of Cyzicus 28
eschatology 103, 105, 106, 109, 110, 112, 116, 117, 124, 126 n. 78, 130, 155, 166
Eupsychius of Caesarea 92
Eusebians, the 33
Eusebius of Caesarea 28, 30 n. 59, 32, 35
Evagrius Ponticus 49
exorcisms 120–21
experience 24, 27, 44, 47–48, 49, 50, 60, 61, 67–68, 71, 85, 92, 94, 95, 99–100, 102, 105, 108, 117, 118, 119, 124–25, 129, 131–32, 134, 135, 140, 144, 147, 150, 154, 156, 160–61, 162, 164, 165, 166

fear 76–77, 83
Fialon, Eugène 72 n. 11, 73 n. 13
Finch, Jeffrey 40 n. 96
Fulford, Ben 126 n. 80

Gallay, Paul 137 n. 8, 138
Gautier, Francis 27 n. 47
Gifford, James 139 n. 14
glorification 86, 114
golden chain, the 100, 101, 104, 106, 116, 131–32
Golitzin, Alexander 100 n. 4
Gorgonia 5, 65, 66–67
Gregory the Elder 3, 5, 51, 73, 83, 85, 95–96, 147–48, 150
Gregory of Nazianzus
– autobiography 146–55
– biography 3–7
Gregory of Nyssa 1, 10 n. 47, 14, 20, 45 n. 111, 49, 74 n. 22, 78, 152 n. 64, 164 n. 4
Gregory of Palamas 49
Gregory the Presbyter 101 n. 7
Gregory of Sinai 49
Gregory Thaumaturgus 28, 59–60, 162
Gross, Jules 41 n. 98

Hägg, Tomas 96 n. 81
Hanson, R.P.C. 8, 16 n. 9, 34 n. 73, 39, 40 n. 94, 42 n. 104, 45 n. 111, 115 n. 50
harmony, harmonisation 6, 55, 63, 67, 72, 78, 88, 97, 102, 103, 105, 109–17, 132, 133, 163, 165
Harrison, Verna 20 n. 22, 21, 131 n. 103
Haykin, Michael A.G. 92 n. 72
healings 120–21
hierarchy 109–14
Hilary of Poitiers 85 n. 56
Hillis, Gregory 24–25, 164 n. 4
Hofer, Andrew 131 n. 103, 147 n. 41, 152 n. 67, 165 n. 7
holiness 134–41, 143, 144, 145, 147, 159, 163
Holman, Susan R. 78 n. 35
Holy Spirit
– divinity of 1, 5, 6, 12, 17, 24–25, 27 n. 47, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38–39, 40, 42, 61, 69, 70, 71–72, 74, 75, 78, 80, 81, 84–85, 87–95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 105, 112, 113, 122, 123, 129, 130, 134, 137, 141, 152, 153, 157, 159, 160–61, 162, 163, 164, 165
– and holiness 134–41, 158, 164, 166
Homoians, the 29
Homoiousians, the 33
hymnography 1 n. 3

Iliad, the 132
illumination 26, 63, 82, 86, 97, 105, 108, 119–20, 121, 122, 143–44

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

image of God 16, 26, 27, 86, 117
imitation 51, 53–54, 64, 83, 87, 104, 109, 125, 135, 142, 155 n. 74
individualisation 10
Irenaeus of Lyons 11, 28 n. 48
Isaac the Syrian 49

Jerome 41
John Cassian 49
John Climacus 49
Johnson, Mark 47–48
judgement 124–25, 129, 165
Julian II 4, 7, 59, 60, 62, 65, 66
Julian the tax-collector 95

Kariatlis, Philip 165 n. 5
Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti 46 n. 1
Kharlamov, Vladimir 34 n. 73, 118 n. 57
knowledge 11, 14, 23–27, 80, 94, 95, 100, 103, 105, 106, 108, 109, 118, 141–45, 155, 159

Lakoff, George 47–48
Lampe, Geoffrey W.H. 92
language *see* theological language
Leahy, Brendan 28 n. 48
Lienhard, Joseph 29–30, 31 n. 64, 31 n. 68
light 56, 73–74, 80, 83–84, 91, 93, 94, 97, 143–44
Lossky, Vladimir 10, 18, 49, 50, 54
Lössl, Josef 153 n. 68
Lucifer 120 n. 60

Macarius of Scetis 49
Macaskill, Grant 15 n. 5
Macedonians, the 41, 42, 134
Mantzaridis, Georgios 77 n. 31
Marcellus of Ancyra 11, 14, 27, 28 n. 51, 29–33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 61
Mark the Hermit 49
Markschies, Christoph 153 n. 68
Maslov, Boris 42 n. 100, 46, 58, 59, 61–62, 120 n. 61
Maximus the Confessor 7, 49, 164 n. 4
Maximus the Cynic 135, 139, 140, 151
McConnell, Timothy P. 74 n. 22
McGuckin, John 3 n. 9, 5 n. 28, 42 n. 100, 47, 71, 72–73, 75, 81, 84 n. 52, 98 n. 87, 102 n. 11
mediation 43, 44, 87, 144, 150
Meijering, Eginhard P. 16 n. 9, 140 n. 20
Menzies, Robert P. 2 n. 5
Meredith, Anthony 6 n. 33, 8
metaphor 46–58, 59, 65, 67, 68, 82, 86, 89, 102, 144, 162, 164, 166 *see also* theological language
Miller, Patricia 147 n. 44
Milovanovic-Barham, Celica 7 n. 34
mirror 56, 60
Moreschini, Claudio 111, 116 n. 54
mystery 52–54, 65, 66, 67, 118, 145

Narkevics, Edgar 22, 84 n. 55
Nicephorus 49
Nicobulus 75
Noble, Thomas A. 8, 138 n. 10
Nonna 3, 96, 147
Norris, Frederick 8, 16 n. 9, 28, 45

Opperwall, Daniel 8, 10, 44–45, 57–58, 137, 138, 146, 152 n. 67
Origen of Alexandria 27, 28, 42, 59–60, 126 n. 84, 149 n. 54, 164 n. 4

pagan philosophy 59
paideia 59
participation 42, 43, 44, 113, 113 n. 44, 164 n. 4
patriarchs 52, 119, 120, 121, 122, 139
peace 107–10, 132
Pentecost 118
perfecting, perfection 55, 63, 64, 82, 83, 105, 109, 113–14, 120, 132, 138, 139, 140, 141, 144, 159, 163, 164, 166
Platonism 11, 58, 120 n. 60
poetry 6, 7, 9, 12, 42 n. 100, 146–55, 156–57, 163
poor, the 64, 111
prayer 26–27, 129, 148
priests, priesthood 55, 57–58, 63, 72, 77, 150
prophets 52, 65, 119, 120, 121, 122, 139, 158
providence 61, 150–51, 152, 153–54

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.

purity, purification 26–27, 51, 55, 61, 63, 64, 67, 72, 79, 82, 83, 86, 89, 97, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 110, 115, 119, 120, 121, 122, 131, 132, 135, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 151, 155, 163, 166

Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew 71, 84, 89, 91, 92 n. 72
Rebillard, Suzanne Abrams 146 n. 40, 158 n. 79, 159 n. 81
resurrection 24, 31, 32, 52, 82, 89, 120–21
revelation 2, 11, 14, 27, 55, 65, 116 n. 52, 123, 142
– day of revelation 110
Rousseau, Phillip 7 n. 35
Ruether, Rosemary Radford 16 n. 8
Russell, Norman 10–11, 46, 49, 57, 60 n. 55, 164 n. 4

Sabellianism 29, 33
Schermann, Theodor 9
Scripture 11, 34–35, 42–43, 51, 52, 55, 56, 58, 65, 71, 76–77, 90, 100–01, 103, 110, 111–12, 116–17, 119, 138–39, 147–48, 152, 154, 157
Scully, Ellen 85 n. 56
selfishness 81–83
Seraphim of Sarov 49
Serapion of Thmius 37
Socrates 29 n. 52
Soskice, Janet 48 n. 10
spiritual circumcision 142, 143
Stead, Christopher 120 n. 61
Stoicism 11, 120 n. 61
suffering 65–68, 77, 82, 85–87, 154 n. 72
Swallow, James Edward 49–50, 92
Swete, Henry 42 n. 103
Sykes, Donald A. 9, 51 n. 19
Symeon the New Theologian 49

Tabbernee, William 28 n. 48
teaching 57
temple 103–09, 113, 116–17, 132–33, 158–59
terminology *see* theological language
Theodosius I 5, 6, 135, 141
theological language 1, 6, 10, 12, 16, 21, 29–30, 32, 34, 36, 37–40, 42, 44, 46–68, 70, 79, 82, 86, 88, 94, 97, 98, 100, 115–16, 153 n. 68, 156, 162, 164 *see also* metaphor
Theophanes the Recluse 49
theopoiēsis 48, 50, 56, 61–62, 63, 67, 88, 97, 116, 162
theōria 25–27, 83, 105, 111
theōsis 1, 4, 8, 10–11, 12, 24, 30, 32, 40, 46–47, 48–50, 51, 54, 57–58, 59–63, 68, 72, 75, 76, 78, 83, 87, 88, 97, 100 n. 3, 102, 105 n. 19, 109–17, 118, 124, 125, 126 n. 78, 129, 131, 132, 138, 144, 152, 154, 155, 162, 164 n. 4, 165, 166
Thomas Aquinas 102 n. 9
Tollefsen, Torstein 60 n. 56, 111 n. 36
tongues of fire 120–21
Torrance, Thomas F. 16 n. 9, 25 n. 41
Tsamis, Dimitrios 152 n. 64
Trinity, the 2, 4, 7, 11, 14–27, 29–30, 35–36, 38, 40–41, 43, 44, 71, 73, 77, 79, 80, 87, 89, 92, 95, 100, 106, 112–13, 114, 116, 117, 118, 122, 132, 135–36, 137, 138–39, 140, 144, 151, 159, 163, 165, 166
– and divine causality 16–19, 20, 22, 25
– and intellect 19–23, 25, 27
– and movement 20–23, 27
– and will 15, 16, 19, 22–23, 25, 27, 61, 108, 150
tropikoi, the 37
Tzamalikos, Panayiotis 56 n. 37

universalism 64

Valens 4
Vinson, Martha 138
virtue 50, 51, 54, 59, 64, 66, 114, 124

Wessel, Susan 87 n. 64
Winslow, Donald 7–8, 10, 26 n. 44, 46, 47, 49, 50, 54, 57, 100, 102 n. 10, 106, 148 n. 47, 154 n. 73, 155 n. 74, 165 n. 6
worship 27, 100, 131, 159

Zizioulas, John D. 25

Copyright © 2019. Mohr Siebeck. All rights reserved.